DOCTRINE OF THE PRIESTHOOD

Let Virtue garnish thy thoughts unceasingly; then shall thy Confidence wax strong in the presence of God; and the Doctrine of the Priesthood shall Distil upon thy soul as the Dews from Heaven. (D & C 121:45)

JANUARY 1996 HANNA, UTAH VOL. 13 NO. 1

NEW LIGHT ON THE LORIN WOOLLEY STORY

AND

EARLY FUNDAMENTALIST BEGINNINGS

Collier's Publishing Co.

Copyright
by
Fred C. Collier
All Rights Reserved

Copies may be obtained
by writing

Collier's Publishing Co.
HC 63 Box 1B
Hanna, Utah 84031
(505) 600-1842
ChurchOfTheFirstborn1842@gmail.com
http://Church-of-the-Firstborn.org

Introduction

Since the rise of Mormon Fundamentalism in the 1920s, there has been a growing controversy over the early history of its beginnings. The Fundamentalist position has been that their beginning actually commenced in 1886, when the Resurrected Prophet Jospeh Smith and Jesus Christ appeared to President John Taylor. According to Fundamentalism, these Deified beings prophetically directed President Taylor to set apart and commission five men with authority to perpetuate plural marriage. The understanding was that the special Priesthood Dispensation of these men would not commence until a future time — not until after the leaders of the Church Elected to abandon the practice of Plural/Celestial Marriage.

The Fundamentalist faith, as expressed above, is predicated upon the testimony of Lorin Woolley, who bore record that he was an eye witness to said events, and that these things took place in September 1886, while President Taylor was living in his father's home, at Centerville, Utah.

President Taylor's stay at the Woolley home is not disputed. His two month residence with the Woolleys came as a consequence of his steadfast resistance to the *immoral mandates* and *tyrannical laws* of the United States Government. During the last two and a half years of his life, President Taylor chose to go into hiding and live on the "underground", rather than submit to harassment, arrest and imprisonment at the hands of federally appointed Carpetbag Officials from Washington.

The Constitution declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of a Religion" — but the Constitution be damned, the Federal Government of the United States deliberately enacted laws with the intent of outlawing the Mormon religion in their practice of Plural Marriage. Through these laws, the way was opened for Federal Prosecution of the Church and its leaders. At long

last, the enemies of Christ finally succeeded in placing the Restored Church where they wanted it. According to the *unconstitutional "laws"* as enacted by Congress, the Church was disincorporated as a legal entity and its property escheated to Carpetbag Officials from Washington. On top of this, no Mormon could immigrate to the United States and no Mormon could vote, hold public office, or sit on a jury. As if all this were not enough, all Church leaders who had more than one wife (and this included almost all of them) were made out to be Criminals — They were legislated into being Fugitives from "justice", who could "lawfully" be hunted down and put in Prison, or shot to death, as some were, should they dare to resist arrest. In short, the Mormon people were denied their Constitutional rights as citizens of the United States on a wholesale basis.

As already stated, President Taylor's stay at the Woolley home is not disputed — what is disputed is the question as to whether or not the events which Lorin Woolley described in his story are true, especially the Miraculous appearance of the Prophet Joseph Smith and Jesus Christ and the Ordination of five men with the mission to Perpetuate Plural Marriage.

J. Max Anderson and Brian Hales have written two books wherein they have character assassinated Lorin Woolley and challenged the historicity of his Testimony. Of course, their reason for doing this, is to discredit Mormon Fundamentalism. Yet all this notwithstanding, of late, new evidence of President Taylor's Vision has surfaced, and this too, from sources which would not have been expected.

As this issue of *Doctrine of the Priesthood* demonstrates, all in all, the historical record would argue hard for the idea that some concessions and honest confessions are in order and long overdue from the parties of both sides of the Controversy.

A shorter version of this work was presented as a response to Brian Hale's paper at the 1991 Sunstone Symposium in Salt Lake City.

New Light on the Lorin Woolley Story
AND
Early Fundamentalist Beginnings*

by
Fred C. Collier

The substance of Brother Hales paper aims to undermine the faith and religious foundation of a whole people. It is therefore no small matter we discuss here this day. Indeed, the aspirations and eternal hopes of tens of thousands hang upon the veracity of the

*An abbreviated version of this paper was delivered as a response to Brian Hales' paper: "'The One Anointed and Appointed' An Analysis of Modern Polygamist Priesthood Authority", at Salt Lake City, Utah on August 10th, at the 1991 Sunstone Symposium. Since this time, Brian has published an enlarged version of his paper in paperback book form. See: *The Priesthood of Modern Polygamy An LDS Perspective*, co-authored by Brian C. Hales and J. Max Anderson, Copyright 1992, Northwest Publishing Inc. 5949 South, 350 East, Salt Lake City, Utah 84107.

Lorin Woolley story! Still, I feel to commend brother Hales for the time and effort which he has spent in order to make his presentation. This is not to say that I would agree with all that he has said. But notwithstanding our disagreements, it is my feeling that in presenting this paper, he has done the Fundamentalist community a service — if only they will be perceptive enough to receive it as such! In saying this I would not be so nieve as to suppose that he has not felt some degree of satisfaction in assaulting those of us who would believe in the present day practice of Plural Marriage — but then, I am sure that I will experience the same satisfaction in my response.

It ought to be pointed out that with but few exceptions, Brian's paper is essentially a condensation and rewrite of an earlier unpublished manuscript which was written by J. Max Anderson during the 1970's.[1] It is certainly good that someone has finally taken the time and interest to put it out. For the most part, the research was done years ago by Anderson and other supportive friends who were themselves archival big shots, and who had liberal access to the records. We are therefore, in every sense of the word, facing the cannon's mouth at somewhat of a disadvantage, for Fundamentalists are not allowed access to the same records in making their defense. Not only so, but by their past actions, both Anderson and his friends have proven that they are willing to suppress information which might in any way support the Fundamentalist position.

This is not to say anything of the personal diaries of President John Taylor, George Q. Cannon, L. John Nuttal and the First Presidency's Office Journal, which thus far have been locked away from the eyes of all, including those with access to the archives. The secretary of the First Presidency told me personally that these diaries were in the First Presidency's Office Vault. During the conversation he even went and double checked to make sure. But if there is a

[1] "Mormon Fundamentalism — A study in the Foundational Claims of Contemporary Polygamous Sub-Cultures" by J. Max Anderson, Vols. 1 and 2. A copy of this manuscript can be found in Special Collections, University of Utah Library.

suppression of records for the John Taylor period, it is quite to the contrary or otherwise where it concerns the Prophet Joseph Smith. For the most part, with the exception of the minutes of the Council of Fifty, and the Cowdery History, the records pertaining to the Prophet's life and teachings have been made public, and whether published or otherwise, they are available for research. These documents have a tremendous bearing on the Fundamentalist doctrine of the Council of Seven Friends or High Priest Apostles.

Before I launch into the topic before us, I want to confess my own qualifications and lack of them. I have never made any big effort to study the lives and history of the five men whom Lorin Woolley stated were appointed and ordained to perpetuate Plural marriage. In 1979 I did spend 3 months of research on the Lorin Woolley Story, in preparation to writing a book review to Max Anderson's book.[2] Among the materials I went through at that time were the diaries of Samuel Bateman[3] whom Lorin Woolley claims to be one of the five who were ordained.

As far as the topic under discussion is concerned, the major focus of my study has been in matters of the Priesthood, with particular interest in the Joseph Smith period. This would have a strong bearing on the Council of Friends and the original context of "the one anointed and appointed" as it was understood by the Prophet at the time he received the revelation on Eternal Marriage.[4]

There is in what I have to say, both good news and bad news, and I must say, I hardly know which to tell first, for what is good to one party is bad to another. In any case, I am persuaded that it is a true saying, that he who only knows his own side of an argument

[2]Anderson's book was published in 1979 by Publishers Press, at Salt Lake City, Utah, under the title: *The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact*. For my review of his book, see "Tannering Fundamentalism", published in *Dialogue a Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 13: <Summer 1980> 130–132. For a more extensive account of my review, see: "Re-Examining the Lorin Woolley Story", published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 1: <February 1981> No. 2.

[3]The Samuel Bateman diaries are presently housed in the Manuscripts department of BYU Library.

[4]D&C 132:7

is not generally well informed even of that — consequently, he is not in a good position to pass judgment upon the issues. To rectify this problem for the Fundamentalists, in the true Lawyer style of a prosecuting attorney, Brian has presented the strongest possible case for the other side. In the process he has clearly pointed out some fallacies in Fundamentalist thinking which are long over due for a change. On this count there is certainly a day of reckoning. But this situation is not unique to Fundamentalism, for in every sense of the word, the same is true for the Church.[5] Indeed, the Priesthood platform upon which the Church has stood for more than a century, is hardly in keeping with the Nauvoo teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith, and within two years, this will be a well established fact.

Sometimes the Truth is a bitter pill! Nevertheless, we are all better off for it. If there is one prayer I would offer up daily, it is "Oh Lord God, do not let me believe a lie, but lead me into all Truth". Truth is what we should all be after! I have never run from a good fight, especially in matters of my religion — I have always been glad to give a reason for my faith, and so I feel now — May the Truth prevail!

There are many things which Brian has said in his paper that are deserving of a point by point response — things which are hardly in keeping with the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith[6] — but

---

[5]On this count, the Fundamentalists are at a disadvantage in owning up to their mistakes and 'misinformation', as they do not have a huge buffer or bureaucracy behind which to hide for Protection.

[6]By this (among other things) I refer to what Brian says regarding the Apostleship and Apostolic succession, the Sealing Keys of Elijah, and the office of "the one anointed and appointed" (D&C 132:7). In these areas it is apparent that Brian has obtained his whole perception and understanding from teachings which were developed after the Prophet's death, but not before. Brian makes the following statement regarding the Apostleship:

"The idea that two levels of Apostleship could possibly exist may come as a surprise to many LDS Church members. The doctrine stems from the fact that Joseph Smith, shortly before his death in 1844, conferred upon the Twelve additional keys they apparently had not received with their original 1835 ordi-

nation. However, it must be remembered that Joseph himself was ordained to the Apostleship by Peter, James, and John when he received the Melchizedek priesthood in June of 1829 ***and he received the additional keys and knowledge from Moses, Elias and Elijah*** in April of 1836 as well as those associated with the temple endowment sometime before May of 1842. Prior to his death, Joseph Smith conferred these extra keys upon the Twelve. ***Exactly why the additional restoration of authority was needed for Joseph and the Twelve Apostles is unclear***, but to suggest that the earlier ordinations were to something less than the full Apostleship is problematic since the Twelve received the same authority in 1835 that Joseph held in 1829. . . . .

"**Except possibly for the period between 1835 and 1844**, virtually all references to the Apostleship by early priesthood leaders suggest that all who received it, received the fullness of it which included all authorities available to mortal man." (p. 6–7)

Practically this whole statement is a subterfuge. Brian backpedals all he can in order to avoid discussion of the ***Fulness of the Priesthood*** and the Presiding relationship which this higher Priesthood naturally sustains to the office and priesthood calling of an Apostle in the Quorum of the Twelve — and this too, notwithstanding the fact that he has had plenty of exposure to the same. Brian's backward attitude reflects the fact that he recognizes that the Priesthood office of King and Priest and the Fulness of the Priesthood presents damning problems to his concept of Apostolic Succession and the office of the "one anointed and appointed".

It will also be noticed that he suggests that the restoration in the Kirtland Temple which was affected by the appearance of Moses, Elias and Elijah, was merely "Keys of Knowledge" but not necessarily Priesthood. If this were true, then everyone who possessed the knowledge of these "keys" , including apostates, would possess the Keys and even the Sealing Keys of the Priesthood. This idea is completely contradictory to the thesis in Brian's paper regarding the office of "the one anointed and appointed", to say nothing of contradicting the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith and recent leaders of the Church. Consider the following statements:

Joseph Smith: — "Now for Elijah. The spirit, power, and calling of Elijah is, that ye have power to hold the key of the *revelations, ordinances, oracles, powers and* ***endowments*** *of the* ***Fulness of the Melchizedek Priesthood*** *and of the* ***kingdom of God*** *on the earth; and to receive, obtain, and perform* ***all the ordinances*** *belonging to* ***the kingdom of God***" (*TPJS* <March 10, 1844> 337)

Joseph Fielding Smith: — "Elijah was reserved to come in the dispensation of the fullness of times and bestow all things *or in other words the* ***fullness*** *of the power of the* ***priesthood***, or the **sealing power**. . . . . I do not care what office you hold in this Church, **you may be an apostle**, you may be a patriarch, a high priest, or anything else, and *you cannot receive the* ***fulness of the priesthood*** *un-*

less you go into the temple of the Lord and receive these ordinances of which the prophet speaks." (*Elijah the Prophet and His Mission* <Oct. 13, 1920> by Joseph Fielding Smith, 1924 printing, 25, 28–29)

Here we have it in certain terms, even from modern Church leaders such as Joseph Fielding Smith, that even in this late day and age, not even being ordained as an Apostle confers on a man the Fulness of the Priesthood. In order to receive this higher Priesthood you must be anointed a King and Priest and be given the Sealings Keys through the ordinances of the Temple. Hence, being ordained an Apostle does not in itself confer all Priesthood Power which can be conferred upon mortal man on Earth.

For more on these subjects, see: "The Apostleship — Apostolic Succession — and the Authority of the Quorum of the Twelve", *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 7: (Oct. 1990) No. 10; "The Nauvoo Doctrine in Light of Alma Chapter 13, *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 3: (Dec. 1986) No. 2; "Priesthood and the Law of Succession, Part 1 & 2", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 1: 1978) No. 5; "The Trial of Sidney Rigdon, First Counselor to the Prophet Joseph Smith" *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 7: (Dec. 1990) No. 12; "The Matriarchal Priesthood and Emma's Right to Succession", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 8: (March 1991) No. 3; "Adoption — Law of the Kingdom — Forgotten Doctrine of Mormonism, Part 1", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 8: (April 1991) No. 4; "The One Anointed and Appointed — That One Man Office In the Priesthood" published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 10: <January 1993> No. 1; "The Church of the Firstborn and its Formal Organization on April 3rd, 1992, Together with a Brief Summary of its Principles and Doctrinal Teachings and a Short History of Succession in the Priesthood", published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 9: <April 1992> 33–44.

Another area of disagreement concerns statements regarding "The Church of the First Born of the Fulness of Times, and its origins and doctrine, in that he applied to them certain teachings and doctrine which are not theirs. In his book Brian makes the following remark:

"Benjamin F. Johnson — LeBaron Line

"This purported line of authority gave birth to the Church of the Firstborn of the Fulness of Times and a splinter group, the Church of the Lamb of God, which claim priesthood authority through Benjamin F. Johnson . . . . This group believes that Benjamin F. Johnson was the head over the Kingdom of God on Earth or the House of Israel. In that capacity, they assert, he appointed Alma Dayer LeBaron, his grandson, to be the Prophet's birthright heir holding the priesthood office of "the Right of the Firstborn" which is the right to stand as Adam (who is the Firstborn) or as God to the human race."

The above statement does not in any way accurately reflect or portray the Priesthood doctrine taught by "the Church of the Firstborn of the Fulness of Times". But on the contrary, the above statement comes from material which I shared with

there is not enough time. Consequently, I will only be able to respond to a few of his remarks. In order to save time, I will commence by making an honest confession, where we agree, and then spend the remainder of time in ironing out our differences.

— The Council of Friends and Manifesto are Lies —

In his paper Brian suggests that the doctrine on the "Council of Friends" was a lie which was put out by Lorin Woolley and Joseph Musser in retaliation to an even bigger lie which was palmed upon the members of the Church only shortly before by the office of the First Presidency.[7] In saying this, I make reference to the 1933

Brian, wherein, I explained my own views regarding the office of the Right of the Firstborn, as referred to in the book of Abraham (see Abraham 1:2–4). It is true that the Church of the Firstborn of the Fulness of Times held certain beliefs regarding the "Right of the Firstborn", but their understanding and doctrine was both different and contrary to that described above. And while it is true that they claimed their Priesthood through Benjamin F. Johnson, yet the explanation as given above by Brian has little or nothing to do with the doctrine of succession as it was taught by them. Here again, what he published was my own views and understanding, not theirs. In view of this, it becomes evident that Brian did not make the effort to acquaint himself with the doctrine and publications of the Church of the Firstborn of the Fulness of Times about whom he has written.

[7]In his paper, Brian states the following:

On 17 June 1933, the First Presidency issued a statement in which they declared, "There is but one person on the earth at a time upon whom the keys of this sealing ordinance are conferred. That man is the Presiding High Priest, the President of the Church." This clear claim to sealing authority may have been the stimulus to Joseph Musser to discover a priesthood line that would make the Keys of Sealing available to him and his fundamentalist followers.

Later that same year, Musser co-authored a pamphlet entitled *A Supplement to the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage* which included the first description of the "Priesthood" Quorum that existed external to the Church and presided over it comprised of Seven High Priest Apostles. This Quorum was also called the "Council of Friends." (p. 4)

Later on Page 10 Brian acknowledges that this message of the First Presidency contained information which was not true, or in other words a lie or lies. He states the following:

Message of the First Presidency which was authored by Heber J. Grant's lawyer Councilor, J. Reuben Clark.[8] On this count I

As the Church endeavored to suppress the knowledge of the revelation [i.e. the 1886 revelation], polygamists rallied to reveal the attempted cover-up. Church leaders wished to eliminate the awareness of this revelation even to the point that the First Presidency issued a statement on 17 June 1933, calling it a "pretended revelation" and indicating that no such revelation existed in the Church Archives. This was unfortunate because it appears that certain of the associated Church leaders [including Heber J. Grant] indeed had a knowledge of its existence and location. As a fundamentalist missionary tool, the attempted cover-up of John Taylor's 1886 revelation should not be underestimated. (pages 10–11)

Brian's kindness, total understanding and tolerance toward the lies told by the First Presidency ought to be noted and contrasted to the belligerent intolerance which he manifests towards the mistakes and "misinformation" which at one time or another has been given out by Fundamentalists.

[8]In his biography on J. Reuben Clark, D. Michael Quinn gives the following information regarding Clark's part in this message:

"Heber J. Grant had been denouncing renegade polygamists for years, and the Church President encouraged Reuben to bring his many talents to that battle almost as soon as he entered the First Presidency. President Grant gave the first orientation for this assignment on 25 April 1933. Within a month, President Clark upon his own initiative drafted the longest denunciation (fourteen printed pages) the Church has ever officially published against post-1890 polygamy.

As approved and issued by the First Presidency on 17 June 1933, the "Official Statement" went far beyond previous Church statements that had simply denied post-1890 plural marriage as a matter of Church policy. The 1933 statement drafted by J. Reuben Clark combined for the first time historical, legal, ecclesiastical, and doctrinal denials of the legitimacy of plural marriage after 1890. The statement summarized U.S. legal actions against Mormon polygamy [all of which according to the United States Constitution as well as revelation from God to President John Taylor were unconstitutional (*UPR* 80:34–38; D&C 98:4–13)], gave a doctrinal justification for the 1890 Manifesto [Before 1890, the same arguments used in this doctrinal justification were advanced by others as justification to abandon the practice of Plural Marriage. In an editorial in the *Deseret Evening News* under date of June 5th, 1885, these so called members of the Church who were putting forth this argument are labeled as the "weak-backed who need a ramrod fastened parallel with their spinal column". In continuing the Editor of the News nullifies the argument by pointing out that there is a difference between abandoning a project such as building a Temple and abandoning the practice of an eternal law and Principle of the Gospel such as Plural Marriage, which was essential for the

advancement and exaltation of man and an inherent doctrine of the Dispensation of the Fulness of Times.], referred to the 1891 petition for federal amnesty signed by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve, reminded readers that the federal government granted Utah statehood upon the provision of perpetual abandonment of plural marriage, and that the Utah constitution incorporated that provision. [All these statements etc. were signed under duress, and therefore are legally null and void.] The statement relegated the performance of plural marriages from 1890 to 1904 as actions of "a few misguided members of the Church, some of whom had been signers of the petition praying for amnesty." [For evidence proving beyond any doubt that this is a lie see "Polygamy in Mexico as Practiced by the Mormon Church 1895–1905", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 1: (March 1981) No. 3; "The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley" *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 4: (January 1987) No. 1; "LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890–1904", by D. Michael Quinn, published in *Dialogue A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 18: (Spring 1985) 9–105; "The Taylor — Cowley Affair and the Watershed of Mormon History", by Victor W. Jorgensen and B. Carmon Hardy, *Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: (Winter 1980) pp. 4–36; *Solomon Covenant — the Passage of Mormon Polygamy* (1992), by B. Carmon Hardy.] Adopting the legalistic argument of Reuben's unused 1923 statement, the First Presidency pronouncement of 1933 described the revelation of September 1886 (which affirmed the practice of plural marriage and had been attributed to Church President John Taylor) as a "pretended revelation" of which the Church archives had no record or corroboration [For overwhelming evidence that this is a lie see *Unpublished Revelations* Vol. 1, Part 88, also pages 177–206; "The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 4: (Jan 1987) pp. 7–8, 31–32; see also text below], dismissed the alleged setting apart of men to continue plural marriage as "illegal and void," and condemned "the corrupt, adulterous practices of the members of this secret, and (by reputation) oathbound organization" of Mormon Fundamentalists as a modern-day version of the satanic Gadianton Robbers of Book of Mormon history. [Obviously these cheap shots, groundless accusations and lies are aimed at destroying the reputation of good and honorable men who devoted their lives to what they believed in. No doubt, if Grant or Clark had been in possession of any evidence to substantiate these accusations, they would have then used it to their advantage.] To a non-Mormon, President Clark explained that the First Presidency issued the 1933 statement against polygamy "because some carnally-minded old birds are saying the Church is not in earnest about the matter, and were winking at the situation. [You might just as well accuse Wilford Woodruff, George Q. Cannon, Joseph F. Smith, Heber J. Grant and many other apostles of being "carnally-minded old birds" for the fact that they also took other wives and perpetuated plural marriage after the Manifesto, as to accuse those who believed in them and who merely followed through with their lead and direction.]

To the First Presidency and to many Mormons who had always opposed post-1890 plural marriages, the 1933 statement seemed exactly what the Church had long needed. As crafted by President Clark, the denunciation of post-1890 polygamy was comprehensive, legalistic, and uncompromising, and it directly denied the priesthood claims of Lorin C. Woolley and his followers. Unfortunately, just as State Department Solicitor Clark had inadvertently transformed the civil unrest of Mexico "from a sandlot revolt into a full-blown rebellion" by issuing a bellicose statement in 1912, he had drafted a First Presidency statement in 1933 that he later realized had transformed a rag-tag collection of polygamist sympathizers who valued their Church affiliation into a cohesive movement of true schismatics (known popularly as "Fundamentalists") who rejected the Church and its leaders, militantly proselytized, and for the first time in the twentieth century became an actual threat to the Church. [It is evident from history that in early days the Church was benefited in the same way from the persecution of its enemies.] With his typical candor, President Clark said in 1945 that *"one of the reasons why the so-called 'Fundamentalists' had made such inroads among our young people was* ***because we had failed to teach them the truth****."* [Clark ought to be commended for his honesty — too bad he lacked the character to tell the truth to the world to whom he lied.] (*J. Reuben Clark The Church Years* (1983) pp. 183–184.

In his book Anderson makes the following statement regarding the 1886 revelation: "Although its authenticity has not been established, for convenience the document concerned is referred to in the text of this book as the 1886 revelation." In concluding his chapter on this revelation, Anderson makes the following statement: "The analysis made in this book suggests that the story is a presumption built up around what is at best an obscure revelation. Even if the revelation were proved authentic, that fact would offer not one iota of proof of the validity of the story that Lorin Woolley built up around it." (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* 64, 76)

Those who know Max Anderson and who have read his original manuscript, will immediately recognize that what is stated above does not square with what he actually thinks, nor with what he originally wrote before his book was published. When it came time to publish his book, the brethren (i.e. Mark E. Peterson, if I remember right) required him to cast aspersion upon the 1886 revelation by stating that "its authenticity has not been established" and referring to it with such derogatory labels as "an obscure revelation", etc. Anderson told me that he thought that this was a small concession to make in order to get his book published. It is regrettable that he was required to compromise his integrity in order to obtain support for the publication of his work. For those who are interested, the following is what he originally wrote:

"The authenticity and history of the original 1886 revelation is a subject of great interest in Fundamentalist circles but of little present significance for the church. Much mis-information and commentary have been published and circulated

about this revelation causing confusion and misunderstanding. [The "confusion and Misunderstanding" all comes from the Church, and stems from the lies which the Church has published regarding the 1886 revelation, the Manifesto and the cessation of Plural Marriage.]

* * * * * *

"It would seem the 1886 revelation to John Taylor was circulated among a certain class of men who were unwilling to accept the discontinuance of plural marriage following the Woodruff Manifesto of 1890. Since these dissidents based a defiant stand in opposition to the later course of the Church on the strength of this revelation President Heber J. Grant concluded to answer the situation with the following statement:

"'It is alleged that on September 26–27, 1886, President John Taylor received a revelation from the Lord, the purported text of which is given in publications circulated apparently by or at the instance of this same organization (the Fundamentalists.)

"'As to this pretended revelation it should be said that the archives of the church contain no such revelation; nor any evidence justifying a belief that any such revelation was ever given. From the personal knowledge of some of us, from the uniform and common recollection of the presiding quorums of the church, from the absence in the church archives of any evidence whatsoever justifying any belief that such a revelation was given, we are justified in affirming that no such revelation exists.

"'Furthermore, so far as the authorities of the church are concerned and so far as the members of the church are concerned, since this pretended revelation, if ever given, was never presented to and adopted by the church or by any council of the church, and *since to the contrary*, an inspired rule of action, the manifesto, was (subsequently to the pretended revelation) presented to and adopted by the church, which inspired rule in its terms, purport, and effect *was directly opposite to the interpretation given to the pretended revelation*, the said pretended revelation could have no validity and no binding effect and force upon church members, and action under it would be unauthorized, illegal, and void.'" (Official Statement, *Deseret News*, Church News Section, June 18, 1933; [see also *Messages of the First Presidency* Vol. 5:327])

"It is understandable, under the circumstances, why President Grant would issue the above statement, but the views he presents *cannot be entirely correct*. He was called to the Apostleship in 1882 and, therefore, would likely have been in Quorum of the Twelve meetings when John W. Taylor referred to this revelation. Abraham H. Cannon reports in his journal that Heber J. Grant was present at the September 30, 1890 meeting when this revelation was alluded to. He was also present at Matthias F. Cowley's trial in May, 1911, where it was mentioned and also at John W. Taylor's trial in February and March of that same year where the matter of the 1886 revelation was a major topic of discussion. It is,

therefore, difficult to believe his 1933 public statement as being literally correct. Perhaps the First Presidency felt a denial was easier than a lengthy and tedious explanation that would have adequately explained the matter. [Anderson's great toleration and understanding for the predicament which made it expedient for Grant and his counselors to lie about and cast aspersion on a revelation from God is interesting, especially when it is contrasted to the vindictive spirit which he manifests throughout his book as he continues page after page to character-assassinate Lorin Woolley.] Oftimes brief comment on an issue that is complicated and little known only tends to create more confusion than it dispels. At any rate this perhaps seemed the wisest course to pursue in view of the involved nature of the matter. [The reason Grant found it necessary to lie about this revelation is because admitting that it is true produces damning problems for the Church which cannot be explained away, especially when seen in view of the later course which the Church took with respect to the late interpretation of the 1890 Manifesto and the continued practice of plural marriage.]

"It would appear that after the issuance of the official statement in 1933 denying the existence of the 1886 revelation a thorough search was instigated. Apparently the search was successful for Anthony W. Ivins reveals the following in a letter to two inquirers from California dated February 10, 1934:

"'The latter purported revelation of John Taylor (1886 revelation) has no standing in the church. I have searched carefully, and all that can be found is a piece of paper found among President Taylor's effects after his death. It was written in pencil and only a few paragraphs which had no signature at all. [There is not one revelation ever received by the Prophet Joseph Smith which has his signature attached to it.] It was unknown to the church until members of his own family claimed to have found it among his papers. It was never presented or discussed as a revelation by the presiding authorities of the Church. [This is not true — the First Presidency's Office Journal would indicate that it was being discussed in meetings at least as early as October 3rd, 1886, and that among those who knew about it was Apostle George Reynolds, who evidently had a copy.]

"'The fact is that neither of these pretended revelations (1880 and 1886) has any purport whatsoever so far as the church is concerned. They were never published or presented to the body of the church for approval, and consequently if such statements were made they have never been in force.'" (*Supplement to the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage*, p. 15, also *Truth* 17:64)

"Apparently the finding of the 1886 revelation by President Ivins was known to other general authorities of the church. In a letter to Fundamentalist Eslie Jensen written later in 1934, Melvin J. Ballard included the following affirmation:

"'The Pretended revelation to President John Taylor never had his signature added to it but was written in the form of a revelation and undoubtedly was in his handwriting; nevertheless it was never submitted to his own associates in the presidency and the Twelve nor to the church.'" (*Marriage*, p. 27)

am persuaded that Brian has hit the nail directly on the head. I guess that Woolley and Musser figured that one big whooping lie deserved another.

Of late, some Fundamentalists have attempted to substantiate the existence of the "Council of Friends" by identifying it with the "Holy Order" and the "Fullness of the Priesthood" — but you might just as well try to dress a hippo in a small bikini as to make the Holy Order into the Council of Friends. The suit just doesn't fit. Those who attempt to confute these organizations only make for themselves more problems and contradictions, as the description and historical background which Lorin Woolley and Joseph Musser gave to the Council of Friends, together with its seven High Priest Apostles, has absolutely nothing whatsoever in common with the Holy Order, Kings and Priests and the Fullness of the Priesthood.[9]

Fundamentalists who found their faith on a belief that the Prophet Joseph Smith ever established a so called "Council of Friends" composed of seven "High Priest Apostles" or any other number, are following a fable — there is not a word of truth in it! And those who persist in this belief are just as mislead as the leaders of the Church, who argue that the Manifesto was a revelation from God. There is not one shred of evidence to support the existence of the Council of Friends, but on the contrary, all the evidence utterly refutes it.

---

* * * * * *

"Could it be that the Lorin Woolley story is a presumption built up around *a little known,* ***but authentic revelation*** *of the Lord to John Taylor?"* ("Mormon Fundamentalism — a Study in the Foundational Claims of Contemporary Polygamous Sub-Cultures" under the chapter heading "The 1886 Revelation", pp. 1, 11–13, 24)

[9]It is significant that Lorin Woolley was well aware of the Council of Fifty. Not only so, but early Fundamentalist publications clearly distinguish a difference between the Council of Friends and the Council of Fifty. The importance of this is found in the fact that the Council of Fifty is an organization that in every way is directly connected to the Holy Order and its ordinances. Indeed, the Council of Fifty was an outgrowth and further development of the Holy Order. On one occasion when in conversation with him, T. Edgar Lyon even went so far as to say that the Holy Order and Council of Fifty was one and the same organization.

Why don't we all come clean and admit the Truth! The time for such fables is past! The war is over! The teachings on the Council of Friends is a lie! And even if it is not as big a lie as the one told by President Grant and his Lawyer Councilor, J. Reuben Clark, it is nonetheless still a lie!

I would rather believe that Lorin Woolley and Joseph Musser knew that the Council of Friends was a lie, which for lack of anything better, they deliberately invented, in order "to beat the Devil at his own game", to quote Charles Penrose — I would rather believe this, than to believe that Woolley and Musser were so benighted and ignorant of the revelations in the Doctrine and Covenants as to believe something so far from the Truth. The Council of Seven High Priest Apostles or Friends never existed on Earth — at least that is, not until Lorin Woolley created it among his Fundamentalist friends.

Personally I don't like lies, but in any case we do not here have time to deliberate on the morality of such tactics. Nevertheless, it is a historical fact that President Wilford Woodruff and his successors adopted a policy of lies and lying as a tool to ward off the blows of a Satanic Government.[10] Consequently, if we are to believe that

---

[10]The United States government is identified with Babylon the Great, and referred to as Satanic in the 1880 revelation of Wilford Woodruff (see *UPR* Vol. 1, 79:1–10, 16–23, 26–36, 62–63; see also 89:6–15, 22).

Due to the corruption of the Unites States Government, in the unconstitutional prosecution of the Church of God, out of necessity, President Wilford Woodruff and the brethren adopted a policy wherein they began to "lie like hell" in order to help their brethren. Of all these lies, without a doubt, the 1890 Manifesto was the biggest. Not only is it the biggest, but it has all the earmarks of being immortal. The lie of the Manifesto and the real purpose in its being issued, has become shrouded in the death of those who made it, and here are we to inherit the immortal lie, which today is bigger by far than ever it was at the time of its original telling.

In accordance with Isaiah, one lie deserves another in order to cover itself up (Isaiah 28:14–20) and so also it was with the Manifesto. Lorenzo Snow lied in order to defend Woodruff's lie, and so also did Joseph F. Smith. The big difference was that these men knew that it was a lie — one which they preached in public but denied in private — indeed, most all of the general authorities were living a double life. Finally the football was passed to Heber J. Grant, who from his own personal

President Woodruff and his successors were good men, and I don't doubt but that they were, then we must also believe that Joseph Musser and Lorin Woolley are in good company.

Having resolved the question of the Council of Friends with an honest confession, let us now get on with something worth talking about, namely the continued practice of Plural Marriage under the legitimate authority of the Priesthood.

---

experience knew otherwise — nevertheless, for the sake of his new found friendship with the world and the international bankers, he took the lie at face value, with a true vengeance upon all those who knew better than to obey it. In 1933, Grant and his fellow Lawyer councilor J. Rueben Clark denied the validity of the 1886 revelation, which as he knew, President John Taylor had received from God. These men denied its existence and stated that even if it had been a revelation from God, the 1890 Manifesto which was adopted subsequently superseded it.

For those who are not aware of this fact, may I suggest that you read Michael Quinn's paper on this subject: "LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890–1904" published in *Dialogue A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 18: (Spring 1985) 9–105. Consider also the following statement from Apostle Matthias F. Cowley: "The reason I didn't consult President Lyman was because it was given me to understand that I should consult no one. I was told to keep my own counsel and was severely censured one time by Brother Cannon for consulting someone else regarding a certain marriage. *Brother Penrose told me once in the city of Mexico, that he had written the manifesto, and it was gotten up so* ***that it did not mean anything*** *and President Smith had told me the same*. I mention these things only to show the training I have had from those over me. I have been conscientious in these things; . . . . . President Snow told me at one time when I went to consult him about marrying Joseph Morrell of Cache county, *that he would not interfere with* ***the unfinished business of President Woodruff***. . . . . I am not dishonest and not a liar and have always been true to the work and to the brethren. I have always been true and faithful myself. We have always been taught that when the brethren were in a tight place that it would not be amiss to lie to help them out. One of the Presidency of the Church made the statement some years ago when I was in the presidency of one of the stakes of Zion in Idaho that he would lie like hell to help his brethren. What I have done has been done conscientiously and under the direction of those higher up not defiantly or with the idea of taking the bits in my own mouth. . . . . President Cannon told me to do these things or I would never have done it. President Snow, did not, *he simply told me that he would not interfere with Brother Woodruff's and Cannon's work."* ("The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 4: (January 1987) 27–28.

TWO BASIC LINES OF PRIESTHOOD AUTHORITY COMING OUT OF THE CHURCH

It is my belief that there were two basic lines of Priesthood which came out of the Church, and for two very different reasons. Brian speaks of these in his paper, but spends most of his time in undermining the line which came through Lorin Woolley. The Priesthood which I hold came through Benjamin F. Johnson. Nevertheless, I also believe that authority for the performing of plural marriages was passed down from Joseph F. Smith to John W. Woolley, who conferred the same upon his son Lorin, and who in turn passed this authority down to others. However my belief in this matter is not founded upon Lorin Woolley's testimony.

INVESTIGATING THE WOOLLEY STORY —SPENCER W[OOLLEY] KIMBALL— IN LOVE WITH A LEBARON AND RELATED TO THE WOOLLEY'S

I first became acquainted with the Lorin Woolley story in 1970. At that time I did all in my power to determine if it was true. I met with Bruce R. McConkie, Ezra Taft Benson and Spencer W. Kimball, and even tried to get an audience with David O. McKay, hoping among other things to see the Diaries of President John Taylor.[11] When I asked Spencer Kimball about the four hidden revelations, I was surprised when he tactfully admitted that they were true by responding that the Woolley's had no right to publish them. As I later found out, Spencer's mother was a Woolley, and he himself was related to John W. Woolley. This being the case, no doubt he had personally heard the story from Lorin in his youth.

There is also another interesting connection. When a young man, Spencer Kimball fell in love with a certain young lady named Maude Lucinda McDonald, whom He wanted to marry. But rather

[11]Joseph Anderson, who was then the secretary of the First Presidency, did allow me to photo copy a few excerpts from the diary of George Q. Cannon for the dates of September 26th and 27th, 1886, but they would not then acknowledge having possession of the diaries of President John Taylor.

than marry Spencer, Maude chose to marry Alma Dayer LeBaron, who had received the birthright and Patriarchy over the Kingdom or Council of Fifty from his grandfather, who was Benjamin F. Johnson. It was this same Maude who later gave birth to a large family of sons, who through their deeds of good and evil have since become most notorious.

Even after Maude's marriage to Dayer LeBaron, there were times when Spencer and Maude would see each other. Years later, Spencer met and shook hands with one of her sons at the close of the April 1952 General Conference Priesthood meeting. This is all mentioned in his biography,[12] but what it does not tell us is that shortly afterwards, Spencer met with this son of Maude in his office, when he confessed that 'when a young man he had fallen in love with his mother and that he had never completely gotten over it.' Spencer Kimball's connection to Mormon Fundamentalism is therefore twofold. Not only was he related to the Woolley's, but when young he fell in love with the woman who would become the wife of Alma Dayer LeBaron.

But to return to our story — finally in my search to determine if the Lorin Woolley story was true, I went to the institute at the University of Utah and there talked to a prominent professor of Church History. After asking about the 1886 revelation and the Lorin Woolley story, this teacher frankly confessed that the revelation was authentic, but that the Lorin Woolley story was false. At the same time he gave me a copy of Dean Jesse's master's thesis, which was basically an attack on Mormon Fundamentalism. I at that time realized that even if the Lorin Woolley story was false, if the revelation was true, then the Church went left when it should have gone straight, and so I stopped attending Church.

But what then of the Lorin Woolley story? I had already met with Max Anderson, and had been persuaded that there were problems, and as far as the story goes, on most counts I had accepted what Anderson had told me. It was not until I was asked to do the review of Anderson's book for *Dialogue* magazine that I ever

[12]*Spencer W. Kimball* 278

learned anything to the contrary. I remember thinking when I accepted the task, that my friends and family in the Church already despised me for leaving the Church, and now so also would the Fundamentalists for confessing what I would have to say about the Lorin Woolley Story.

According to Anderson's book, with the exception of the 1886 revelation, just about every last detail in the whole of Lorin Woolley's story is a lie. I felt that this Book Review was important, and that I owed the project some time, and so I spent three months doing research. Much to my surprise, in my search I found materials documenting all the details of the first third of the Lorin Woolley story, and all coming from documents which were written down in the time period that the story was supposed to have taken place. I even found materials substantiating the meeting Lorin claims to have taken place on September 26th, 1886, and other indications concerning the meeting which was supposed to have taken place the next day.[13] The problem was that with the exception of the 1886 revelation, nothing happened on the day that Lorin Woolley said it did. Obviously, the reason that he had the correct date for the revelation was because it had been circulated — it was dated, and he had a copy of it.

Anderson has made out that the whole of the Woolley story is a total lie, and Brian follows in his tracks as closely as he dares, but the facts do not vindicate their position. My research would indicate that the Lorin Woolley story was composed by Joseph W. Musser from journal notes which he had recorded over a period of many years.[14] The testimony did not come from Lorin alone, but it also came from John W. Woolley and Daniel R. Bateman. There are parts of the story which took place in 1885, that Lorin could never have witnessed, but which according to the diary of Samuel Bateman, his son Daniel R. Bateman did. In other words, John W. Woolley, Lorin Woolley and Daniel R. Bateman all recounted

[13]See Footnote 20.

[14]Max Anderson has made the same observation to me personally in years past.

events which they remembered from the underground days, which encompassed a two year period, and years later, Joseph Musser scrambled his notes of these recollections, and compressed the whole of the spectacular events into a story which supposedly took place in two days. Finally Musser presented this hodgepodge to Lorin Woolley who signed it and certified it as correct. Of course all of this makes for easy game in polemics, especially when the critics have access to primary documents for the two days in question. Anderson and Brian would have us believe that if the Woolley Story didn't happen on these two days, then the whole of it, along with all of Fundamentalism is a total lie and all its advocates a bunch of "wildflowers"![15] But while their muck raking tactics[16] might make for good polemics, they don't make for good history. Indeed, a fair analysis of those same primary documents would witness to something else altogether.

It would be far more appropriate to discredit the whole Church for the Lie of the Manifesto, than it would be to discredit the whole of the Woolley story simply because it did not give the proper dates

[15]In his closing remarks Brian states that: "The Modern polygamist movement did not grow as a living branch, preserved by the Lord, on a *sickened tree*. Rather, it sprouted as wild flowers *in an abandoned field*." (p. 19)

As we have and will see, the tree which is the Church did in fact turn sick — sick with the love, praise and wealth of the World — and the abandoned field is the Fulness of the Gospel which as he rightly declares, the Church discarded in order to join hands with the damned. Today the Church has even gone so far as to crawl into bed with the Protestants.

[16]Brian sets the pace at the commencement of his paper with a back handed compliment which he offers to Fundamentalists: "Recently a variety of news events in the Inter-mountain Area have highlighted polygamous families. The infamous activities of the LeBarons or the Singer-Swap group have cast a negative shadow on a people who are generally very tranquil and God-loving."

One might just as well commence a discussion on the Church and its teachings with mention of the "Mountain Meadow Massacre" — the Mormon Danite Bands of Missouri — the execution of Gary Gilmore — the insane murder torture rapes of Ted Bundy — the pipe bomb murders of Mark Hofmann, the famous Mormon forger, or any one of hundreds of other Latter-day Saint criminals — it would be at least as fair to do it with the Church as it is to do it to Fundamentalists. But the truth is, such things have no place in this discussion.

for the events which it describes. Nevertheless, of a truth, the lies have all come home to roost and they have become a part of our cultural heritage. This is true for the Church and the Fundamentalists, as the Authorities of both have lied.

If we are ever going to learn the Truth in this matter we must approach the subject with an open mind. We must go back to the primary sources and unravel the story from the beginning, and then follow it through to its present development. Indeed, it is impossible to fully comprehend the Fundamentalist movement and their Priesthood claims independent of their history. This becomes apparent when it is realized that *the Fundamentalist Priesthood and their line of authority did not begin with the invention of the "Council of Friends" and consequently, neither need it end when it is proven to be false*. The fact that their doctrine is false does not in itself deny the validity of their Priesthood, any more than the false doctrine of the Church denies theirs.[17] But even if it doesn't deny their Priesthood, without a doubt it certainly indicates a lack of inspiration on the part of those who concocted the doctrine.

THREE PARTS TO THE LORIN WOOLLEY STORY —THE 1912 ACCOUNT— THE MIRACULOUS APPEARANCE OF JOSEPH SMITH

For convenience I divide the Woolley story into three basic parts — the beginning, the middle and the end. As I have already stated, the beginning can be substantiated, and so also can most of the middle, but it is the end that has difficulties. I have already published elsewhere my findings regarding the first third of the story,[18] so we will now focus on the miraculous events of the middle. It is this part of the story which tells of the appearance of the Prophet

[17]For information regarding the Church's false doctrine on the Priesthood see "The Apostleship — Apostolic Succession and the Authority of the Quorum of the Twelve", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 7, No. 10.

[18]See "Re-examining the Lorin Woolley Story", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 1: <February 1981> No. 2.

Joseph Smith and Jesus Christ to President John Taylor. Until recently the earliest known account of the Lorin Woolley story was the 1912 version. In this account Lorin tells of the appearance of the Prophet Joseph Smith to President John Taylor while he was living in his father's home at Centerville, Utah. This account reads as follows:

In the latter part of September, 1886, ***the exact day*** *being not now known to me*, President John Taylor was staying at the home of my Father, John W. Woolley, in Centerville, Davis County, Utah.

At the particular time herein referred to, President Taylor was in hiding (on the underground). Cha[rles] H. Barrell and I were the "guardsmen" on watch for the protection of the president. Two were usually selected each night, and they took turns standing guard to protect the President from trespass or approaching danger.[19] Exceptional activity

---

[19]In his book, Anderson debunks the idea that Lorin Woolley served as a guard for President Taylor. Then after this he concludes with the following statement:

"Guards for President Taylor's party were chosen for their physical qualifications as well as for their courage and faithfulness. Lorin Woolley had no qualifications of physical size or strength, nor did he have a reputation for courage and bravery — despite his personal claims. Woolley was actually a small, frail man, and perhaps many of his claims arose in compensation for his frailty." (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* 41, see also 40–42).

While it is true that Lorin was a "small" man and perhaps even "frail", when compared to Samuel Bateman and Charles Wilckens, yet this is no argument that he never served as a guard. Contrary to what Anderson suggests, even though Lorin may have been comparatively small, in all probability his ears, eyes and mind functioned just as well as those of Bateman and Wilckens — and who knows, perhaps even better. If Max had only thought a little, he would have realized that even big strong men need to sleep. Indeed, no matter how tough, two years without sleep is more than any man could stand — and on this count, the locals could assist greatly by staying up at night and standing guard. At the first indication of approaching danger, there would be no need to go out and have a fist fight — all they need do was sound the alarm.

Since Anderson cites from the Bateman diaries on this point, he ought not to have neglected to mention what Bateman's diary clearly states, namely that the locals were in fact involved in guarding President Taylor and party. Not only so, but they were even placed on the payroll. And not only were there guards at the

was exercised by the U. S. Federal officers in their prosecutions of the Mormon people, on account of their family relations in supposed violation of the federal laws.

Soon after our watch began, Charles H. Barrell reclined on a pallet and went to sleep. President Taylor entered the south room to retire for the night. There was no door-way entrance to the room occupied by President

---

residence where President Taylor was staying, but there were also other guards placed out in the street. Moreover, Bateman's diary indicates that not only was Lorin Woolley involved with the President and his party during the three months that President Taylor stayed at the Woolley home, but that he continued in carrying the mail etc. after President Taylor and party moved further north to the Rouche residence in Kaysville. It was during this time that the Woolley home became known and used as "the half way house". The mail going to and from Salt Lake would often be dropped off at the Woolley residence, whereupon another party would carry it to its ultimate destination.

Consider the following entries from Bateman's diary:

"May 17th, 1887: "Bro. Woolley came with a letter about 3 o'clock p.m., containing news that the deps were calculating to make a general raid from Bountiful to Kaysville. I [i.e. Samuel Bateman] had Bro. Rouche see that the guards were put out promptly at night. . . ."

On July 27th, 1887, President Taylor died, and the following day those who had been in the President's party began to break up and move back to their homes. Samuel Bateman describes his involvement with locals whom he had employed to guard the President's party as follows:

"Tuesday, July 26th, 1887: I started for the city at 20 minutes past 8 o'clock. It was a hard task for me to part with Bro. Rouche and family for we had been there 8 months and 4 days and had been treated very kindly. Some of us shed tears, for to me it was almost like leaving my own home. I called to see *Bro. Taylor, one of our guards. I thanked him* ***and the other brethren*** *who had been on guard* for their kindness in being so diligent in guarding the servants of the Lord, and I had made arrangements with Bro. Rouche to pay them for their services, and *I told Bro. Taylor to dismiss the guards under his charge* at 1 o'clock a.m., as all would be out of the way by that hour. I also called at Farmington to see my old friend, *Thomas Abbott who had charge of our special guard at that place*. We were very glad to see each other. *I told him also to dismiss the guards that were under his care* at 1 o'clock a.m., and that Bro. Rouche would settle with him for their services. He expressed the same feeling as did Bro. Taylor. I thanked him very kindly for their kindness to the servants of the Lord, and then went on to the city." (Diary of Samuel Batemen, July 26th, 1887, Special Collections, BYU Library) For more on this subject and Lorin Woolley working for the FBI, see footnote 23.

Taylor, except the entrance from the room occupied by the guardsmen. Soon after 9 o'clock, I heard the voice of another man engaged in conversation with President Taylor, and I observed that a very brilliant light was illuminating the room occupied by the president. I wakened Barrell and told him what I had heard and seen, and we both remained awake and on watch the balance of the night. The conversation was carried on all night between President Taylor and the visitor, and never discontinued until the day began to dawn when it ceased and the light disappeared. We heard the voices in conversation while the conference continued and we saw the light.

My father came into the room where we were on watch, and was there when President Taylor came into the room that morning. As the President entered the room, he remarked, "I had a very pleasant conversation all night with the Prophet Joseph." At the time President Taylor entered the room his countenance was very bright and could be seen for several hours after. After observing that some one was in conversation with the President, I went out and examined all the windows and found them to be fastened as usual.

The brethren were considerably agitated about this time over the agitation about plural marriage, and some were insisting that the church issue some kind of edict to be used in congress, concerning the surrendering of plural marriage, and if some policy was not adopted to relieve the strain, the government would force the Church to surrender. Much was said in their deliberations for and against some edict or manifesto that had been prepared,[20] and at a meeting that afternoon, at which a

[20]In his book Anderson argues that there was no manifesto under consideration during September 1886. Yet even the September 26th, 1886 revelation testifies otherwise, as the whole topic at issue was the abrogation of Plural Marriage. In fact, contrary to what others have thought, that revelation set the stage for the Woodruff manifesto of 1890, wherein it states that "it is more pleasing to me that men should use their free agency in regard to these matters" (*Unpublished Revelations* 88:5).

The idea of the 1890 manifesto was for the Church to bow out of its former role of fostering, encouraging and commanding its members to enter into the practice of Plural Marriage and to place the responsibility upon the shoulders of the members of the Church as individuals. According to this plan, if the Church no longer commanded its members to enter the practice, and a man upon his own initiative entered the principle and was caught and taken to court, it would be the individual and not the Church which would be liable for prosecution by the

government. The 1886 revelation took the first step in this direction, by placing the responsibility upon the individual, rather than the Church commanding them to enter it, for: "it is more pleasing to me that men should use their free agency in regard to these matters." (*UPR* 88:5) Apostle John W. Taylor, stressed this idea even more strongly, when in 1911, he presented his copy of the 1886 revelation to the quorum of the Twelve, wherein he changed the word "more" to "now":

"And Furthermore it is **now** pleasing to me that men should use their free agency in regard to these matters" (*UPR* p. 206)

In this context, the word "now" clearly indicates a new policy change.

As far as an 1886, 87 manifesto is concerned, aside from the 1886 revelation itself, there is also the Tucker Bill which was being pushed in Congress. Church agents and political friends of the Church had sponsored the "Scott Amendment" to counteract the affects of the Tucker Bill. Essentially the Scott Amendment was a move for Utah Statehood, under the compromise of Utah coming into the Union with a Constitution which would forever prohibit polygamy or Plural Marriage in the new state. There was a great deal of pressure put upon President Taylor to accept this compromise by different Church agents and political friends. However, notwithstanding this, President Taylor steadfastly refused to accept the terms of the Scott amendment. (For documents demonstrating Taylor's resolute attitude toward the Scott Amendment, see "The Political Platform of the Manifesto", published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 4: <February 1987> 1–19) The diaries of Samuel Bateman reveal that Lorin Woolley was involved with the President and his party during this whole period which proves beyond doubt that he was in fact a witness to these things, just as he testified that he was. No doubt, it is this controversy, which Lorin Woolley witnessed and refers to in his story when he says:

"The brethren were considerably agitated about this time over the agitation about plural marriage, and some were insisting that the church issue some kind of edict ***to be used in congress***, concerning the surrendering of plural marriage, and if some policy was not adopted to relieve the strain, the government would force the Church to surrender. Much was said in their deliberations for and against some edict or manifesto [i.e. the Scott Amendment] that had been prepared, and at a meeting that afternoon, at which a number there were present and myself, I heard President Taylor say: "Brethren, I will suffer my right hand to be cut off before I will sign such a document".

It is ironic, that notwithstanding Taylor's opposition to the Scott Amendment, yet ultimately it was accepted by Church agents in Washington, who are the culprits who got it up in the first place, and that too, without First Presidency consent. In this regard, it is significant that several months before President Taylor died his health began to fail him. It was at this crucial time that his councilor, President George Q. Cannon assumed upon himself the responsibility of the reigns of Church

number there were present and myself,[21] I heard President Taylor say: "Brethren, I will suffer my right hand to be cut off before I will sign such a document." (Lorin C. Woolley Statement, of October 6, 1912, Church Historian's Office)

In this account Woolley does not remember the exact day of the appearance, but only that it was in the latter part of September.

Government, Taylor's other councilor being out of the country in Hawaii. It is my belief that it was actually Cannon who finally accepted the terms of the Scott Amendment on behalf of the other members of the First Presidency. He did this, in view of the fact that once Statehood was gained, the law would never be enforced anyway. So Cannon authorized the writing of a new constitution which would forever prohibit Plural Marriage in the new state of Utah. In following through with other necessary political necessities, Cannon divided the Church politically, and made the move to obtain Statehood under the guise of compromise. Since Taylor was still alive, future generations would credit all these things to his administration, and he would be remembered as being the one who began the move towards capitulation and compromise, when in fact it was actually his councilor George Q. Cannon who deserved the credits.

A similar situation has again happened in our day in the case of Ezra Taft Benson. As all who are acquainted with his teachings well know, throughout his life, Benson was diametrically opposed to the "New World Order". Not only so, but his whole life and teachings were dedicated to opposing it. Yet when he finally became President, he was too old and lacked the strength and vitality to run the Church, and so his councilor, Gordon B. Hinckley, ran the Church in Bensons name. And so it was during Bensons' administration that the Church altogether joined hands with the damned. Hinckley has placed the whole Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on a railroad, and ran it head long into hell as one of the leading principles and proponents of the New World Order in the Americas — and so Hinckley continues to this day. Future generations will yet credit Hinckley for making Mormonism to be the same thing in the New World Order of the Americas that ancient Christianity became to the Roman Empire through Catholicism and the influence of Constantine.

[21]In the original document paragraph five was altered to read as it does above. Before being changed it read as follows: ". . . and at a meeting that afternoon, at which there were present George Q. Cannon, John T. Cain, Hiram B. Clawson, Charles H. Wilkins, John W. Woolley and myself . . ."

The fact that Lorin would write the above names down and then cross them out shows that he was not certain exactly who was and was not there at the meeting. If he was not certain in 1912, how much less certain would he have been 17 years later when the final version was composed by Joseph Musser in 1929.

It will also be noticed that there is no reference to the ordination of five men, and many other things which can be found in the 1929 account. To date, no historical evidence has been produced that would contradict the substance of this statement. In this connection it is significant that everything in the 1912 account concerns matters that came under Lorin's personal observation. In other words, none of the material in this account was borrowed from Daniel R. Bateman or John Woolley.

Recently another account of the Lorin Woolley story has come to my attention. This one is much earlier and comes from an unexpected source — namely from the personal diary of President Spencer W. Kimball's father, Andrew Kimball. On January 25th, 1897, which is fifteen years earlier than the afore mentioned account, Andrew Kimball recorded the following brief entry in his diary regarding Lorin Woolley:

> Elder Woolley testified that he knew that the Prophets Joseph, Brigham and Heber lived for he had seen them as they appeared to Pres. John Taylor in Bro. John Woolley's house (Andrew Kimball Diary, Church Historian's Office; See also *Unpublished Revelations* Vol. 3, under date of September 26th and 27th, 1886)

Another reference to an even earlier telling of the story comes from the wife of Apostle John W. Taylor, who told her son, Samuel W. Taylor, that in 1893 her cousin Lorin told her the "strange tale of a secret revelation about the Principle":

> Lorin said that right next door on the adjoining farm of John W. Woolley, President John Taylor was in hiding the night of September 26, 1886, when he received a revelation concerning the Principle and set men apart to continue it[22] regardless of what the Church might do officially on the

[22]While I do not doubt that Lorin talked to Mrs. Taylor, I would question whether or not she could remember all the details of what he said more than forty years later. It is important for us to recognize that the source just quoted comes from interviews which Samuel W. Taylor made with his mother. These interviews commenced in 1936 and lasted for 13 years, when the book was finally published in 1951. As of that time the 1929 version of Woolley's story had long since been published, and generally speaking, was the only known account of the Woolley story. At that early date the story was seen or viewed as a whole, not in parts, and therefore mention of the vision would naturally be associated with the ordination of five men.

matter. Lorin said that he was one of the men set apart. (*Family Kingdom* <1951> by Samuel W. Taylor, p. 72)

Another interesting account comes from Olive Woolley Coombs, who was the daughter of Lorin Woolley. Olive remained in the Church throughout her life, but in 1979, she told me that on one occasion when a young girl, she went over to visit John W. Woolley who was her Grandfather, and while sitting at a table, he told her that "the Lord Jesus Christ has sat at this table".[23] Another account which

[23]Even though the 1912 account does not mention the appearance of Christ, other later accounts do. The above quote is taken from my memory of a telephone conversation, but it has been 13 years since the interview took place. The conversation was recorded, but unfortunately the recording has been lost. However, I do have in my possession a tape recording of another interview with Olive and her oldest brother Ross, both of whom remained faithful and active in the LDS Church throughout their lives. This interview was conducted by Mary Ellen Smoot and Marilyn Sheriff — it was part of the research conducted by them in preparation for writing their book on the history of Centerville, Utah. In 1978, after being given the task of reviewing Max Anderson's book for *Dialogue*, I learned of their publication and the account of President Taylor's vision, which is contained therein, and paid a visit to one of the authors in hopes of learning more regarding the source of their information. Much to my surprise, the author responded to my questions by giving me the original tape recording of their interview with the Woolley's, of which the following is an extract:

"Olive: . . . Lorin C. Woolley was Justice of the Peace too, in Centerville and by the way, he was also . . . . . an FBI man — my dad was.

Female: With that mind that would have been a great interview.

Ross: He was a special guard for the United States people that used to come here when Governor Spry was the governor [of Utah, between 1909 and 1917] — under Governor Spry. [In my (i.e. FCC's) interview with Olive, she told me that on one occasion her father (i.e. Lorin Woolley) was one of the guards for the President of the United States when he came to Utah for a visit.

In the process of his character assassination of Lorin Woolley, Anderson debunks the idea that Lorin was ever employed by the FBI (see *The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* 145–146). However, as it turns out, Governor Spry's daughter was married to a Woolley, and it is possible that Lorin obtained employment with the FBI through Spry's influence.]

Olive: Yah. Yah — he was a FBI man under Governor Spry. But anyway, I remember this Justice of the Peace and there was — we used to have a . . .

Ross: Are you going to tell them about the couple that was going to get married?

originated with Olive and her brother Calvin Woolley (who was also a faithful member of the Church) is found in a book dedicated to the early history of Centerville. Olive and Calvin were interviewed by Mary Ellen Wood Smoot and Marilyn Fullmer Sheriff, who later

---

Olive: laughing — Yah, you tell them about it — the couple that's going to get married.

Ross: This couple came — wanted a place that was out of the way in some little bit of a hole hick town — so they came down to the house and dad married them in the parlor — in the front room. That house is still there — I don't know their names, but we were all there.

* * * * * *

Brother: . . . I have a table that he made for John W. Woolley we they (sic) were married and it was taken from City Creek Canyon — the log that it was made out of was taken from City Creek Canyon. They say — I have a little thing that says on there — the card that was written on there that said that they could have made ten such tables out of this one log that they brought down — and this was — I have the table — and Gwen has the high-chair that was my dad's and was made by him and this Samuel Ensign — grandmother's father — in the 50's.

Female: Is that right? Now . . . (tape is stopped)

Olive: . . . the antiques that every one of us liked. . . . . .

Olive: By the way, that table I have is the one that the — that was written when he came out from this room the next morning — that's the table that John Taylor wrote the talk that he had with the Savior and the . . .

Female: The Savior?

Olive: Uh-huh. That table is the one that was written on — that I have. (tape stopped and started again.)

. . . I remember is the fact that my dad and my grandfather both said that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints was true and that it always would be true and that no matter how far they might [stray from the truth] they might leave this or that out, that the Church itself was true and he taught his kids — all of us will tell you that the Church of Jesus Christ is true — and it will remain true and that we should follow it, even so. And the thing I remember about is that they used to have firesides — really they were just firesides — I've been to two or three of them — firesides, and that's all they were at the time — and they talked about it and said that the "Principle" was true.

It [i.e. Plural Marriage] actually started in Nauvoo and that Joseph Smith was a polygamist himself — he was a — Eliza R. Snow was his wife there — and by the way — I think one of the Woolley's had a child in polygamy in Nauvoo. I don't know which one it was, do you? I couldn't tell you about that, but I understand what that was, I think I heard that one time. Don't quote me on that, but I understand it."

published the following account of John Taylor's vision in their history of Centerville:

One of the most delightful experiences that came as a direct result of writing this book was the many interesting visits we had with children and grandchildren of original pioneers. We would make an appointment to visit with them and ask them to talk about their memories of early life in Centerville. We taped the conversations, and this chapter is a direct result.

* * * * * *

CALVIN WOOLLEY AND OLIVE WOOLLEY COOMBS

President Taylor at Woolley Home

One memory that stood out in the lives of all the Woolley children and grandchildren was that of having President John Taylor and many other General Authorities stay for a period of time in the John Woolley home.

There was a hollow in back of the John Woolley home where they played horseshoes and baseball. Lorin C. Woolley had a photogenic mind and he used to ride back and forth from Salt Lake and bring them information from the church offices.

One night Lorin Woolley was on guard outside. He saw a bright light shining out of President Taylor's window and he heard voices. He was afraid someone had slipped passed him unnoticed so he stepped to the window. He could hear three voices conversing in a very peaceful manner and a calm feeling came over him that assured him all was right! The next morning he asked President Taylor about it, and was told he had heard the voices of the Prophet Joseph Smith and the Savior. They had come to reassure President Taylor that polygamy was sanctioned of the Lord.

At one time Brother Richards was listening as Lorin Woolley was recounting to President Taylor exactly what he heard the men saying who were at that time sorely persecuting the leaders. And he said, "You mustn't let that boy talk like that! President Taylor assured him that he needed to know the very inflections of their voice in order to know exactly how to handle the situation. They never suspected this teenage boy and he was never stopped. Shortly thereafter, President Taylor left the Woolley home, went to Kaysville and passed away there. (*The City In-Between, History of Centerville, Utah including Biographies and Autobiographies of some of its original settlers* <1975, Centerville, Utah> 47, 49)

You would suppose that President Spencer W. Kimball was speaking of this same visitation of Christ, when at the close of his April 1978 conference address he quoted President Taylor as making the following statement:

"I know that God lives. I know that Jesus Christ lives," said John Taylor, my predecessor, "for I have seen him." (*The Ensign* <May 1978> 48)

After making this statement, some supposed that President Kimball was alluding to the 1886 visitation as attested to by Lorin Woolley, and inquires were made to President Kimball. His response was that he had made a mistake, and that he actually meant to say that George Q. Cannon had made the above remark and not President Taylor. The evidence would show that he told the truth, but this notwithstanding, considering that President Kimball had John Taylor's diaries in his office safe, the above remark is certainly an interesting Freudian slip. In any case, President Kimball's statement as given above is a verbatim quote from a discourse which was given by George Q. Cannon and subsequently published in the *Deseret Weekly* on October 6th, 1896.[24] I have not been able to determine exactly when it was that Cannon saw Christ, but evidently he alluded to this same experience during the dedication of the Salt Lake Temple:

I have been greatly favored of the Lord. My mind has been rapt in vision and [I] have saw the beauties and Glory of God. I have saw and conversed with the Savior face to face. (Francis Asbury Hammond Journal, 20 April 1893, as cited in *Collected Discourses* Vol. 3:285)

Be it remembered, that according to Lorin Woolley, George Q. Cannon was one of those present at the eight hour meeting when Christ appeared, and it is not at all unlikely that this is the appearance to which he referred. In this regard, it is significant that all the George Q. Cannon diaries have recently been turned over to the family — all, that is, except for the entries from September 29th,

[24]See also *Gospel Truth* Vol. 1 *Discourses and Writings of George Q. Cannon* 134.

1886 to October 13th 1886. These pages were cut out of the diary — of all the many volumes, these are the only missing pages. It is my feeling that the eight hour meeting actually happened in the early part of October, possibly on the 3rd, rather than late September, so the missing pages in Cannon's diary are most significant.

An 1885 Visitation of the Prophet Joseph Smith to President John Taylor

Some time after January 5th, 1933, which was in the twilight of Lorin Woolley's life, he told of another even earlier occurrence when the Prophet Joseph Smith appeared to President John Taylor. According to this statement, this visitation took place before President Taylor and party came to stay at the Woolley residence. The following is Lorin's account of this appearance:

> John Taylor and company, including Geo. Q. Cannon, [and his] clerk John L. Nuttall and others, stopped at the residence of Wm. H. Hill in Mill Creek for about three weeks, going there from the residence of Bro. White or Carlisle, and before he went to Centerville, [to stay at] John W. Woolley's house. While at the Hill house he dedicated the place as one of safety for Bro. and Sister Hill and family, and their posterity; and while there he was visited at least once by Joseph Smith the Prophet." (Items from the Book of Remembrance of Joseph W. Musser, p. 24)

At first appearance, it would seem that the more Lorin Woolley talked, the more fantastic his claims became. Not only did the Prophet appear to President Taylor while living at his fathers, but now Fundamentalists must also account for at least one other appearance which took place before. According to Brian and Anderson, this would all be just so much more evidence to destroy Lorin's credibility. And so it would appear, until just recently when two other accounts of the Prophet Joseph Smith appearing to President Taylor came to light — one by Philo Dibble and the other by Apostle Merriner W. Merrill. On July 31st, 1886, nearly

two months before the Lorin Woolley story is supposed to have taken place, John Moon Clements recorded the following entry in his diary:

Went to the High Priests meeting held in the Font house. Philo Dibble spoke of this being the resurrection day. And that Joseph Smith had been to Pres. John Taylor and conversed with him in his body[25] about this

[25]In his book Max Anderson debunks the idea of Joseph Smith being resurrected in 1886 (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact*, 91–98), when the Lorin Woolley story was supposed to have taken place, yet we see here a clear allusion to the fact that he was resurrected, and that too, at least as early as 1885 — so here again, Lorin Woolley was right and Anderson was wrong. Considering the fact that Anderson portrays Lorin Woolley to be nothing but a consummate liar, it is interesting how many times he told the truth, huh!

To be sure, there is a great deal which we do not know about the resurrection. Consider the following statements from President Young:

"I will now tell the people once [and] for all, that no man lives, or ever did live, that can teach a doctrine except he possesses the keys of it. I never professed to preach and understand the doctrine of the Resurrection. Joseph Smith did not profess to teach it, only so far as to say he believed in the doctrine of a literal resurrection of the body. . . . . As to the resurrection I frankly confess I do not know how the particles which form the new body is brought together, anymore than I can tell how the same soil can produce grass, flowers, and trees from their simple seeds. What has been written, and what the Lord is disposed to reveal touching this doctrine is all I ever profess to know. A man has no business with it in particular until he shall receive the keys of it." (*The Teachings of President Brigham Young* Vol. 3 247, 252)

"How are you going to get your resurrection? You will get it by the President of the Resurrection pertaining to this generation, and that is Joseph Smith Junior. Hear it all ye ends of the Earth; if ever you enter into the Kingdom of God it is because Joseph Smith let you go there. This will apply to Jews and Gentiles, to the bond, and free; to friends and foes; no man or woman in this generation will get a resurrection and be crowned without Joseph Smith says so. The man who was martyred in Cartage Jail [in the] State of Illinois holds the Keys of Life and Death to this generation. He is the President of the Resurrection in this Dispensation and *he will be* ***the first to rise from the dead***. When he has passed through it, then I reckon the Keys of the Resurrection will be committed to him. Then he will call up his Apostles. You know I told you last conference I was an Apostle of Joseph Smith; and if faithful enough I expect Joseph will resurrect the Apostles; and when they have passed through the change, and received their blessings, I expect he will commit to them the Keys of the Resurrection, and they will go on resurrecting the Saints, every man in his own order." (*The Teachings of President Brigham Young* Vol. 3 363)

crusade against us, and that he felt grieved at the course his son Joseph [III] was taking.

It was probably this same appearance to which Apostle Merriner W. Merrill referred when in a meeting with the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles on July 7th, 1891, he made the following statement:

> The last time I met Pres. Taylor he said to me: 'I may never see you again and I want to tell you that I have seen the Prophet Joseph who said the Lord did not want His people to be concerned about the raid or inquire when it would cease. "It will stop in mine own due time," said the Lord. Joseph, however, said it made him ["]sad to see his own son (Joseph Smith Jr. [the third], who was then traveling through the territory preaching against this Church) trying to tear down what he had given his life to establish." (Abraham H. Cannon Journal, July 7th, 1891, Special Collections, University of Utah Library)

Both of the above accounts would indicate that the Prophet's son, Joseph Smith III was in the territory preaching against Utah Mormonism at the time the Prophet appeared to President Taylor. This would place the Prophet's appearance some time between June 17th, and December 21st, 1885.

All of these accounts are most interesting and serve to vindicate Lorin Woolley's testimony, but it would be far more interesting to read the more complete accounts as they are undoubtedly recorded in the personal diaries of President John Taylor, George Q. Cannon, and L. John Nuttall, all of which are locked away in the First Presidency's office Vault. What do the brethren really have to hide?

The Last Third of the Story

As I have already stated, it is the last third of the Lorin Woolley story which presents the most problems and this being the case, it should come as no surprise that the contents of this portion of the story were the last to be written and added in. It would seem that the more that Lorin told the story, the bigger it got. Altogether too

much of the last third of the story smacks with what can be found in the local newspapers, current events and changes in the Church and its policies which took place during the first half of the administration of Heber J. Grant.[26] There is for example a reference to the change in the method of Priesthood ordination which President Grant made after the death of Joseph F. Smith.[27] In Lorin Woolley's 1929 account of his story, a prophecy of this event is placed on the lips of President Taylor, as an evidence of apostasy which would occur later in the Church. It is my feeling that most of these last additions were added to the story for the purpose of Polemics against the Church. They are lies, just like many others which came out of the First Presidencies office against those involved in perpetuating Plural Marriage.[28]

---

[26]For more on this see J. Max Anderson's two volume unpublished manuscript, "Mormon Fundamentalism — a Study in the Foundational Claims of Contemporary Polygamous Sub-Cultures" under the following chapter headings, "Church Financial Bondage" and "Temporal and Spiritual Bondage". A copy of this manuscript can be found in the Special Collections Department, at the University of Utah Library)

[27]For a thoroughly researched treatment on this subject, see J. Max Anderson's "Mormon Fundamentalism — A Study in the Foundational Claims of Contemporary Polygamous Sub-Cultures", see the chapter on "Priesthood Conferral". Special Collections, University of Utah Library.

[28]However, in the case of the Church and their lies, they went one step further — President Grant used his influence to break up families and also influenced State Officials, not only in Utah, but also in other surrounding States, to get those practicing plural marriage prosecuted and imprisoned in the State Penitentiary — hence, the persecuted became the persecutor. President Hugh B. Brown even went so far as to urge for the enactment of a law which would require the death sentence for third offenders of the anti polygamy law! It must be conceded however, that his vindictive spirit stemmed from the fact that his daughter became converted to the present day practice of plural marriage, and entered into a polygamous family. In the end Brown had his way — through his political influence and deadly threats, he succeeded in destroying his daughter's marriage.

The following statement comes from D. Michael Quinn's biography of J. Reuben Clark:

"President Grant gave J. Reuben Clark a mandate to suppress the present practice of polygamy, and President Clark went at it ***with a vengeance***. Although

he did not originate the idea of requiring persons suspected of polygamist sympathies to sign a loyalty oath, Reuben's experience in overseeing Justice Department activities against suspected subversives during World War I predisposed him to favor a Church-wide requirement in the mid-1930s for suspected Fundamentalists to "solemnly declare and affirm that I, without any mental reservation whatever, support the Presidency and Apostles of the Church; that I repudiate any intimation that any one of the Presidency or Apostles of the church *is living a double life* . . . that I denounce the practice and advocacy of plural marriage . . . and that I myself am not living in such alleged marriage relationship. In 1938 he began commissioning loyal priesthood leaders to identify "the adulteryites" by *conducting surveillance on all persons attending meetings at residences of known Fundamentalists*. In 1939 he encouraged the Salt Lake City public librarian to *exclude Fundamentalist polygamy literature from library holdings*, and in February 1940 asked the Salt Lake City postmaster to ***prohibit the mailing of Fundamentalist publications***. At a meeting with stake presidents of Salt Lake County a month later, one stake president suggested that the district attorney *"was a good Latter-day Saint and would persecute* [sic] *the 'new polyg's' criminally* ***if it were deemed wise,"*** to which ***President Clark responded*** *that* ***criminal prosecution should begin as soon as possible***.

President Clark's overseeing of this quiet campaign to ferret out polygamists was at times frustrating and dismaying. The Fundamentalists discovered the surveillance almost immediately in 1938, and in August 1939 Joseph W. Musser published an open letter which identified J. Reuben Clark as the General Authority responsible for *"clearing the community of polygamous teachings and living. . . .*" Although President Clark *was also receiving separate lists of Fundamentalists from the Salt Lake City Police Department in 1940, that source of information was cut off when a new police chief assigned the police investigators to other work in 1941*. Although Reuben hoped that a decline in polygamist growth would result from the combination of Presidency statements, Church court actions, and the activities he was directing, the coordinator of the Salt Lake City surveillance program reported to him that the Fundamentalist "group is growing by leaps and bounds and the attendance of young people is astonishing."

Despite such setbacks and administrative frustrations, Reuben pressed on with his efforts to oppose Mormon polygamists. In 1944 a lawyer representing men on trial for polygamy telephoned him at home with an offer to withhold testimony embarrassing to the Church if the First Presidency would stop supporting civil prosecutions of polygamists. President Clark rebuffed the offer on the basis of the legal distinction between ***Malum in se*** (intrinsically bad) and *malum in prohibitum* (bad only because it is prohibited, not because it is intrinsically bad).

As he talked he tried to draw some distinction between malum prohibitum and malum in se. I said: "Well, in the eyes of the law and disregarding entirely religious considerations, the pre-Manifesto people were guilty of adultery and so are these people guilty of adultery." [As we shall see, the revelations of God as

given to the Prophet Joseph Smith (and which to this day still remain as an integral part of the Doctrine and Covenants, and upon which the lives of all Saints should be based), do not sustain Clark's unwarranted assumption:

And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood — if any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery for they are given unto him; *for **he cannot commit adultery** with that that belongeth unto him **and to no one else***. And if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him; therefore is he justified. (D & C 132:61–62)

Again, with respect to the ***Law of the Land***, the Lord states the following in an 1882 Revelation which was given to President John Taylor:

You ask, what shall we do? Thus saith the Lord God, "Obey my law, and seek not to become a law unto yourselves, nor trust to outside influences; but seek in the way appointed to the Lord your God. Ye are my spokesmen, I am your God; and as I have before said, I now again say, "Henceforth do as I shall command you."

Concerning the course taken by the United States they have (the liberty), a right, to reject this law themselves, as they have (the liberty), a right, to reject the Gospel; but it is contrary to the provisions of the Constitution, ***which is the supreme law of the land***, for them to prohibit you from obeying it. Therefore abide in my law which I have revealed unto you, saith the Lord (*Unpublished Revelations* Vol. 1, Part 80:34–38)

This same fundamental Principal was stated on another occasion in a Revelation which was given to the Prophet Joseph Smith in 1833:

And now, verily I say unto you concerning ***the laws of the land**, it is my will that my people should observe to do **all things** whatsoever I command them*. And that law of the land ***which is constitutional***, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges, belongs to all mankind, *and is justifiable before me*. Therefore, I, the Lord, justify you, and your brethren of my church, *in befriending that law which is **the constitutional law of the land**;* And as pertaining to ***[the] law of man***, whatsoever is more or less than this, *cometh of evil*. I, the Lord God, make you free, therefore ye are free indeed; and the law also maketh you free. Nevertheless, when the wicked rule the people mourn. Wherefore, honest men and wise men should be sought for diligently, and good men and wise men ye should observe to uphold; otherwise whatsoever is less than these cometh of evil. And I give unto you a commandment, that ye shall forsake all evil and cleave unto all good, that ye shall live by every word which proceedeth forth out of the mouth of God. For he will give unto the faithful line upon line, precept upon precept; and I will try you and prove you herewith. And whoso layeth down his life in my

cause, for my name's sake, shall find it again, even life eternal. Therefore, be not afraid of your enemies, for I have decreed in my heart, saith the Lord, that I will prove you in all things, whether you will abide in my covenant, even unto death, that you may be found worthy. For if ye will not abide in my covenant ye are not worthy of me. (D&C 98:4–15)

For those who lack respect for the Revelations of Joseph Smith and President John Taylor, an examination of the doctrine taught in the New Testament by Christ and his disciples will reveal that they held the same political views as those which are set forth in the Doctrine & Covenants:

Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men. (Acts 5:29)

In view of the above, it is obvious that Lawyer J. Reuben Clark held the wicked laws of a Satanic government in higher esteem than he did the Revelations and Commandments of God — and this being the case, we must ask ourselves: how is it that Clark ended up in the Office of the First Presidency? It was the doing of the business mind of President Heber J. Grant — indeed, during Grants administration, many others of like mind became General and Stake authorities in the Church — but to continue with our subject:] I asked him whether adultery was malum in se or malum prohibitum, to which he replied "I won't answer," to which I replied, "You have answered."

As the conversation progressed I said, "Well, there is nothing the Church can do about it under any circumstances. We cannot go down and ask that this indictment be quashed."

On this occasion and subsequently, President Clark denied that he had instigated any legal actions against the Fundamentalists, and in 1951 he even declined to furnish evidence against the polygamists to a detective agency representing the Arizona Attorney General. But he encouraged Latter-day Saints to report what they knew about current polygamists to the civil authorities, he monitored the progress of criminal court cases involving polygamists, and he classified as "Ultra Confidential" the ten days' advanced notice Arizona's governor gave him of the world-famous police raid against the polygamists of Short Creek, Arizona, in 1953 (which *Time* said had "the ponderous secrecy of an elephant sneaking across a skating rink"). Because of a national backlash of sympathy for the Fundamentalists after the 1953 Short Creek raid, President Clark took care during the last years of his life to arrange for local news blackouts of stories that could give favorable publicity to the Fundamentalists. (*J. Reuben Clark The Church Years* 184–186)

For more on this see: "Changed Faces: The Official LDS Position on Polygamy 1890–1990" <1990> by Martha S. Bradley, *Sunstone* Vol. 14: <Feb. 1990> 29–32.

In my estimation, it is these late editions which do the most to discredit the Lorin Woolley story. For example, there is a letter in the John Taylor Papers, wherein he was requested to resolve a dispute among the Seventies as to the proper method of ordination, and contrary to Lorin Woolley's statement, President Taylor responded by saying that both methods of ordination had been used and that both methods were acceptable:

Salt Lake City, UT,
March 25, 1887.
Elder Robert Campbell, City
Dear Brother:

We might answer the question contained in the letter of F. G. Froerer and Angus McKay by asking another question: Did the Priest (after the order of Aaron) who was ordained according to the form given by Moroni in the 3rd chapter of his book, on page 609 [i.e. Moroni 3:3], of the BOOK OF MORMON, receive the Aaronic Priesthood when there was no mention of its bestowal upon him or anything said concerning his being in the Church of Christ?

When a man is ordained to an office and to all the gifts and blessings pertaining to that office, if the man who ordains him has the authority necessary to ordain him, he certainly receives all that is conferred upon him.

It is very wrong for Elders in the Church to be caviling and getting up disputes upon such questions as are mentioned in this letter. Instead of contending upon such a subject, if there be any doubt respecting the sufficiency of the ordination, (it would be) far better to remove it by giving him another ordination that will leave no room for question than to have disputes about its validity.

With kind regards
Your Brother
John Taylor[29]

---

[29]John Taylor Family Papers, Special Collections, University of Utah Library; see also J. Max Anderson's unpublished manuscript: "Mormon Fundamentalism — A Study in the Foundational Claims of Contemporary Polygamous Sub-Cultures", see the chapter on "Priesthood Conferral". A copy of this manuscript can be found in Special Collections at the University of Utah Library.

The Ordination of Five Men by President John Taylor or an Appointment from President Joseph F. Smith

Probably the most important segment of the whole of Lorin Woolley's story is the account of the five men being ordained by President Taylor to perpetuate Plural Marriage. Brian's argument here is strong and convincing. It is not just the lack of evidence which might be accounted for in the suppression of the above mentioned records, but it is the lack of action or manifestation in the lives of the five men who were supposed to have been ordained.[30]

[30]This of course would except John W. Woolley and Lorin Woolley, both of whom were involved in perpetuating plural marriage until their death, and perhaps also George Q. Cannon. However, with the exception of Post 1922 statements from Lorin Woolley, there is no evidence to substantiate the idea that John Woolley ever thought of himself as performing plural marriages under a commission or directive from President Taylor. But on the contrary, statements made by John Woolley in 1914 state that he received his directive from Mattias F. Cowley. On the 13th of January 1914, John W. Woolley wrote the following confession:

"At Centerville, Davis County, Utah on the 16th day of January, A. D., 1914, Pres. Francis M. Lyman and Anthony W. Ivins called at my home, and in answer to questions asked, I made the following statement:

"Some months [ago] I met Mathias F. Cowley on the street and he asked me if I was familiar with the sealing ceremony. I told him I was. He said, "If any good men come to you don't turn them down." I believed from that statement that it was still proper that plural marriages be solemnized, and that President Smith had so authorized Cowley to instruct me." (Affidavit in Anthony W. Ivins's Papers, Utah State Historical Society, see also: *The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* 142–143)

Three days earlier, on the 13th of January, 1914, Anthon H. Lund recorded the following statement:

"The twelve met on the case of Joseph Silver who has married a plural wife. John Woolley having confessed to having done the sealing. Silver like the rest who have done like he has done lied about it and denied it. I told the door-keeper not to let John Woolley come to the Temple until the matter is settled. We were shocked to hear that a man working in the temple would dare to do such a thing. He is sick today so he could not appear before the Council.

"I spent the day in the office and in the evening attended S. S. Board Meeting. Peter C. Peterson came in from Ephraim and called God to witness that he spoke

the truth: When he heard that John Woolley had confessed he had not so much to say. He promised to go with the brethren to see Brother Woolley, but instead of going with them he got into an automobile and rushed up to see Brother Woolley. Brothers Francis M. Lyman and Anthony W. Ivins found him there. They got the evidence and Joseph Silver was cut off the Church by the Apostles." (Anthon H. Lund Journal, January 13, 1914; see also Anthony W. Ivins Diary, Utah State Historical Society, entry at the end of the 1913–1914 book; see also *The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* 142)

On March 1st of the same year, Anthony W. Ivins again recorded other details regarding John Woolley's polygamous activities:

"March 1st, 1914. In the Evening P. K. Lemmon called at the hotel. I served notice on him to appear before the Council of Twelve and show cause why he should not be excommunicated for unlawfully taking a wife. He stated to me that Nathan G. Clark had written him that if he wished to take a plural wife to come to Centerville where he — Clark — would meet him at a house 2 blocks west. He followed directions and went to the house of a young man named Woolley and told him what he came for. The young man said there would be a man there soon to attend to the matter for him.

"Later an older man came to him and performed the ceremony. After concluding the man told him that he must say nothing about the marriage as they would both be excommunicated if they were found out. He told the girl, as soon as they were alone, that he did not believe it was a marriage at all, and it was all off.

"He had never lived with the girl as his wife and did not intend to do so until he had come to Salt Lake and satisfied himself that the ceremony was performed by proper authority. He had never talked with bro. Cowley on the subject. He would appear before the Council and make a full statement of the facts. He had met Bro. Musser at the Fisher [home] some time ago and he had told him that Woolley had given the whole thing away." (Journal of Anthony W. Ivins, Huntington Library, San Marino, California, January 1911, pp. 199–200; see also *The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* 143–144)

It would appear that John Woolley's involvement in performing plural marriages commenced shortly after his appointment as Stake Patriarch of Davis County Stake in 1911. It would be interesting to see if Lorin Woolley performed any plural marriages before the death of his father.

George Q. Cannon became involved in perpetuating plural marriage shortly after the Manifesto was signed, and continued in it until his death on April 12th, 1901, but there is no evidence to indicate that he perceived his authority as coming from an 1886 appointment from President Taylor. In fact, according to Apostle Matthias F. Cowley, it would appear that President Lorenzo Snow perceived of President Cannon's work being connected with Wilford Woodruff (see footnote 10). It is significant though that according to Kenneth L. Cannon II, President

George Q. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith ignored direction from President Lorenzo Snow, and going contrary to his council, went ahead and performed new plural marriages, both against his council and without his knowledge. This might indicate that both Joseph F. Smith and George Q. Cannon felt that they had authority to perpetuate plural marriage from another source, regardless of President Snow's wishes. As Quinn points out however, it is more likely, notwithstanding statements to the contrary, from President Snow, that one way or another they actually had Snows tactic approval (See Kenneth L. Cannon II, *Sunstone* Vol. 8:1, 2 <January — April 1983> 29–31; see also Quinn, LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890–1904, published in *Dialogue, A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 66–73). But if the other case should prove to be true, it could be argued as support for Lorin's contention. According to Lorin Woolley, even though Joseph F. Smith was not one of the five, when he arrived home from his mission from the Hawaiian Islands, just before President Taylor's death, he was given a commission in common with the other five.

As already stated, there is no first hand information coming directly from John Woolley that would indicate that he ever acted under a commission from President John Taylor to perpetuate plural marriage. Aside from Lorin's statement, the closest to this is the September 22, 1929 statement from Daniel R. Batemen which states that he was told about the ordination of five men by both Lorin and John Woolley: "I was privileged to be at the meeting of September 27, 1886, spoken of by Brother Woolley, I myself acting as one of the guards for the brethren during those exciting times. The proceedings of the meeting, as also the circumstances relating to the Woodruff Manifesto as related by Brother Woolley are correct in every detail. I was not present when the five spoken of by Brother Woolley were set apart for special work, but have on different occasions heard the details of the same related by both Lorin C. Woolley and John W. Woolley, and from the circumstances with which I am familiar, I firmly believe the testimony of these two brethren to be true.

"Signed: Daniel R. Bateman."

According to Lorin Woolley, Charles H. Wilcken and Samuel Bateman were the other two men among the five who were set apart by John Taylor, but there is no indication with which I am aware that would indicate that they were in any way involved in performing or perpetuating plural marriage. On this count, it is significant that notwithstanding the apparent close relationship which Daniel R. Bateman enjoyed with his father, on December 20, 1936, he confessed that his father had never told him of being set apart to continue plural marriage:

[Daniel R. Bateman] Bore testimony that Mormonism is true. His father, being one of the five set apart, did not tell him so, but did testify to Bro. Finlayson of the fact, and the latter had written to him of the event. Others of the five had told him and from their testimony and through the Spirit he knew it was true. (Diary of Joseph Musser Dec. 20, 1936)

There is one piece of testimony coming from Samuel Batemen's daughter (sister of Daniel R. Batemen) which is germain to this subject. In 1948 she published a book wherein she described her father's reaction to the Manifesto as follows:

"Under President Woodruff the underground life remained the same, except that Samuel had much more to do. . . . . Father had loved all of the men he had worked for, but if he had a favorite it was President Woodruff.

Father's diary over a period of years reveals increasing troubles between the church and the United States Government officials on matters other than polygamy. These conflicts were having an effect on the status of plural marriages, and the eventual giving up of polygamy by the church was certain. It is not my purpose to discuss the various phases of these problems except as one or two affect my story.

"When he went into Exile, Father swore that the United States Deputy Marshals would never take him alive. After nearly four years of successfully eluding arrest, he voluntarily surrendered to the deputies. Several factors contributed to this. Whether he knew it or not — and I feel sure he knew it — the institution of polygamy was breaking down. Other men who had been with him on the Underground were surrendering. He decided to follow their example. His sentence was eighty-five days in the penitentiary, with a fine of seventy-five dollars. It was the latter part of 1888 and the first part of 1889 that he served his sentence. There is a lapse in his diary and I have no definite record of the day he surrendered, nor the day he finished his sentence.

"President George Q. Cannon surrendered himself to U.S. Marshal Dyer, September 17, 1888 and was sentenced by judge Stanford, under two indictments to 175 days imprisonment and a fine of $450. He served the time and paid the fine an was released February 21, 1889. He and Father were together in the penitentiary a part of that time, and they were happy over that fact. . . . . .

"The idea of statehood so long in the minds of many people, now seemed more desirable than ever before, but it was known that statehood could not come while polygamy was practiced. Someone had to face the facts.

"Eventually in the fall of 1890 the Manifesto was issued. Something was known about it even before September when it was put into written form. According to President Woodruff's own words attempts had been made for some time within the church to check the practice of polygamy. On Oct. 6, 1890 the Manifesto was presented to the General Conference in Assembly, and according to authentic reports the vote was unanimous to stop the practice of polygamy. . . . . .

"There may have been a few in that audience who did not vote, and a few may have remained away in order that they might not commit themselves. But father and mother were at that conference and they voted to sustain the manifesto.

Lorin Woolley is the only first hand witness who has left a record that it ever happened. There is no first hand testimony about ordinations coming from John W. Woolley or Daniel R. Bateman. No one, including Lorin Woolley, seemed to know about it until 1921 or 1922, which was five years after the death of Joseph F. Smith. And yet, as of that time Lorin had been telling about other parts of his story, such as the miraculous visitations, for at least twenty nine years.

Brian indicates that the earliest mention of Priesthood authority being conferred by President Taylor upon the five men comes from a statement from Lorin Woolley, which Joseph Musser recorded in his diary in 1922. There is however, another account from Apostle John A. Widtsoe, which would back date this story eight more years, to the time of John W. Woolley's excommunication in 1914. Widtsoe's account reads as follows:

True, in its wording, it does not claim to be a command from God, but "advice" from President Woodruff. But any advise from the president of the church was regarded by most church members as inspired by God. . . . .

"More than once I heard Father say before other members of the family that when he went to that Conference he and some of his friends who had suffered exile and imprisonment had determined to vote against the Manifesto. "But," said Father, "some power not my own raised my arm, and I voted to sustain President Woodruff in this matter. As soon as I had done it a sense of peace and contentment came over me.

"To him the principle was still true. He had tried to live it honorably. He had openly acknowledged his second wife and her children, and would still acknowledge them before the world as long as he lived. But his intelligence told him that time and circumstances may change even that which he believed had been revealed by God. He worshipped a God of change and eternal progress and it was fitting that He should manifest himself again for the good of His people. That which had served its purpose could now, for good and sufficient reasons, be laid aside for something new.

"Mother said nothing as usual, but she looked her satisfaction. What a sense of relief must have come over her when the Manifesto was passed. There would be no more Exile and night raids with their attendant anxieties. The future surely would be brighter." (Juliaetta Bateman Jensen, *Little Gold Pieces* <Salt Lake City: Stanway Printing Company, 1948> 126–30; see also *The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* 137)

I will tell you of an experience I had some years ago. While in President Joseph F. Smith's office in Salt Lake City, John W. Woolley came into the President's office and asked if he could have a few weeks off from his work in the temple in order that he could visit with his Brother Sam who was then president of the mission in the South Sea Islands. I believe it was Samoa. Brother Woolley was a worker then in the Salt Lake Temple. President Smith gave him the time off that he wanted, and just as Brother Woolley was about to leave the President said, "John, it has been brought to my attention that you have been performing plural marriages in the Salt Lake Temple, is that correct?" Brother Woolley he said, rather hung his head and answered, "Yes, President Smith, I have." President Smith then looked directly at Brother Woolley and said, "Did President Taylor ordain you and others to carry on plural marriage independent of the Church?" Brother Woolley answer[d], "President Smith I have lied to others about this, but I cannot lie to you as President of the Church, No he did not. (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact*, 141–142)

The above statement is most significant — and that too in ways which you would not suppose. If the Lorin Woolley story, or the ordination of five men by President Taylor was ever mentioned in any of the excommunication trials over plural marriage before the 1920s, I am unaware of it. Yet here we have John A. Widtsoe putting it in the mouth of President Joseph F. Smith, and this too, eight years before it is ever mentioned even in Fundamentalist circles. Bringing it up at this early time, even in a negative light would tend to support Lorin Woolley's testimony, but it appears far more likely that the whole statement is another big whopping lie which Apostle John A. Widtsoe made up many years after the fact, with the deliberate intention of discrediting Mormon Fundamentalism.[31]

---

[31]It is important that we realize that the above statement was not actually written by John A. Widtsoe, but rather it was recorded on April 13th, 1964, by Lloyd Ririe, who stated that Widtsoe related the above to him while on a train between Calgary and Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada, "in about 1945". The fact that Anderson would neglect to acknowledge this in his book demonstrates the extreme lengths to which he is willing to go in order to strengthen his case against Lorin Woolley. The whole of Ririe's statement reads as follows:

Statement concerning the purported Ordination of John W. Woolley

The interview that you want a record of took place on the train between Calgary and Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada.

In 1935 each member of the bishopric received a complimentary copy of the *Truth Magazine*. This periodical was published by the Fundamentalist organization. At that time Joseph W. Musser was the editor. Being interested in the magazine, I took a subscription and have the first ten or twelve years of it.

In about 1945 I was asked by the stake president to interview Owen LeBaron, whose fellowship was then in question because of his association with these organizations. While traveling on the train, I noticed another passenger, Brother John A. Widtsoe, and told him where I was going and why. I then asked if he knew anything about the fundamentalist movement. He said, "I will tell you of an experience I had some years ago. While in President Joseph F. Smith's office in Salt Lake City, John W. Woolley came into the President's office and asked if he could have a few weeks off from his work in the temple in order that he could visit with his Brother Sam who was then president of the mission in the South Sea Islands. I believe it was Samoa. Brother Woolley was a worker then in the Salt Lake Temple. President Smith gave him the time off that he wanted, and just as Brother Woolley was about to leave the President said, "John, it has been brought to my attention that you have been performing plural marriages in the Salt Lake Temple, is that correct?" Brother Woolley he said, rather hung his head and answered, "Yes, President Smith, I have."

President Smith then looked directly at Brother Woolley and said, "Did President Taylor ordain you and others to carry on plural marriage independent of the Church?" Brother Woolley answer[d], "President Smith I have lied to others about this, but I cannot lie to you as President of the Church, No he did not."

I asked Brother Widtsoe if I wrote this interview up in my notebook if he would sign it, to which he replied he would be glad to. In fact, he said, "I will do better than that. When I go back to Salt Lake City I will look up dates and more of the circumstances and write you a letter about it."

I never received this letter from Brother Widtsoe [He did in fact receive a letter from Widtsoe, but that which he describes above was not in it — see below], and because of conditions and circumstances I never followed it through. Some years later after moving to Provo with my family, and being in Salt Lake I met Brother Widtsoe's secretary on the street, she being a young lady I knew in Calgary, and she told me that Brother Widtsoe was at home with an illness from which he was not expected to recover. Naturally, I thought of this letter that he was going to send me, but because of his illness I did not attempt to get in touch with Brother Widtsoe.

But on June 21, 1953 I wrote President Joseph Fielding Smith telling him about the above mentioned interview, and on June 22, 1953 I received an answer from Joseph Fielding Smith in which he states: "What you have said about the interview with Brother Woolley is absolutely correct because I was there myself."

Thus, we have the witness of two apostles that John W. Woolley was not ordained by President John Taylor to carry on plural marriage independent of the Church.

April 13, 1964 [Signed:] Lloyd Ririe
1084 North Fifth West
Provo, Utah

The above statement was signed in the presence of:

LaMae E. Ganaid
Richard L. Anderson

(Special Collections, BYU Library)

The following letter was sent by Widtsoe to Ririe on November 19, 1945:

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
The Council of The Twelve
47 E. South Temple Street
Salt Lake City, Utah

November 19, 1945

Mr. Lloyd J. Ririe
215 9th Avenue, N. W.
Calgary, Alberta, Canada

My dear Brother Ririe:

Thank you for your note of November 12th.

The matter that you raise was brought to my attention when I was up in Canada a few weeks ago. It is difficult to know what to do with these people. The so-called revelation to John Taylor, to which they refer, is not in their favor at all, if it is read properly, that is, intelligently, as everything should be read. On the contrary, it is a definite answer against their claims.

As for the claim that President Taylor gave authority to various people to carry on the principle in opposition to any action that might be taken by the Church, the only answer is that there is evidence sufficient on hand to prove that this did not occur; nor did the President of the Church, a prophet of God, ever undertake to do such a thing.

I would advise everybody not to listen to these people when they come with their burden of woe, attempting to destroy the Church to which they really claim adherence. Personally, I am ashamed of them.

Cordially your friend
and brother,
[Signed:] John A. Widtsoe

JAW:AM

In his letter John A Widtsoe stated that President Taylor's 1886 revelation did not favor the Fundamentalist position. This is another blatant lie by a leading official of the Church. If this were true, what reason would the Church have for burying the Revelation and denying its existence. Indeed, let us read it and judge the matter for ourselves:

A Revelation on Celestial Marriage given through President John Taylor at Centerville, Utah, on September 27, 1886:

My son John: You have asked me concerning the New and Everlasting Covenant and how far it is binding upon my people. Thus saith the Lord All commandments that I give must be obeyed by those calling themselves by my name unless they are revoked by me or by my authority and how can I revoke an everlasting covenant for I the Lord am everlasting and my everlasting covenants cannot be abrogated nor done away with; but they stand forever. Have I not given my word in great plainness on this subject? Yet have not great numbers of my people been negligent in the observance of my law and the keeping of my commandment, and yet have I borne with them these many years and this because of their weakness because of the perilous times. And furthermore it is more pleasing to me that men should use their free agency in regard to these matters. Nevertheless I the Lord do not change and my word and my covenants and my law do not. And as I have heretofore said by my servant Joseph all those who would enter into my glory must and shall obey my law and have I not commanded men that if they were Abraham's seed and would enter into my glory they must do the works of Abraham [(D&C 132:28–35)]. I have not revoked this law nor will I for it is everlasting and those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof, even so Amen. (John Taylor Papers, Church Historian's Office; see also *Unpublished Revelations* Vol. 1 88:1–9)

Aside from the lie in Widtsoe's letter, there are a number of problems with Ririe's account of Widtsoe's statement. For one, Ririe states that Widtsoe was going to send him a letter wherein he would include the dates and circumstances etc. pertaining to the supposed event described above. Ririe then says that he never got the letter, but as we have seen from the above, a letter written to Ririe was in fact discovered in the Widtsoe papers, and even though the subject of Fundamentalist Priesthood authority is mentioned in Widtsoe's letter, still there is no mention of the incident which Ririe describes in his statement. In ending his statement, Ririe states that he talked to Joseph Fielding Smith, who also verified what he claims that Widtsoe had told him, and "Thus, we have the witness of two apostles that John W. Woolley was not ordained by President John Taylor to carry on plural marriage independent of the Church." All that can be said is that if we have two Apostles who made such a statement as Ririe describes above regarding an incident in 1914, then we have two Apostles who lied. On the other hand, perhaps in this case, Ririe is the liar and the two Apostles above named stand to be exonerated. In this regard, it is significant that on July 13th,

1955, Joseph Fielding Smith made another similar statement to Dean Jesse. There was however one difference, and that is that in this account, there was no mention made of the ordination of five men. Consider the following statement of Joseph Fielding Smith as recorded by Dean Jesse, on July 13, 1955:

"I was well acquainted with John W. Woolley. He was a good man, but permitted himself to be drawn into the performing of a so-called "plural marriage." When this rumor first appeared, John W. Woolley was called into a session with the Council of the Twelve, President Francis M. Lyman, presiding. Before that body he denied that he had performed any plural ceremony and we accepted his word, for we believed him to be a man who would not deceive the Twelve. President Francis M. Lyman reported to President Joseph F. Smith the fact that Brother Woolley had been before the Twelve and that he had disclaimed any association with those who were engaged in this traffic. My father replied to President Lyman that he was very grateful to know that Brother Woolley was clear, *for my father had* ***the utmost confidence*** *in John W. Woolley*.

"Some time later John W. Woolley was in the presence of President Joseph F. Smith, and President Smith said to him, "John, I am happy to know that you have not been involved in any of those so-called 'plural marriages.'" John W. Woolley hesitated a moment and then replied: "President Smith, I cannot lie to you. I am guilty." Then he confessed his wrong doing. Of course action had to be taken. (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* pp. 140–141)

In view of all that Anderson has written, it is most significant that Apostle Joseph Fielding Smith would testify that his father (i.e. President Joseph F. Smith) "had the utmost confidence in John W. Woolley". With so much confidence, it makes one wonder what other callings or responsibilities President Joseph F. Smith might have reposed in him — such as being called as a scape-goat, as were apostles Matthias F. Cowley and John W. Taylor.

Olive Woolley Coombs, who was the daughter of Lorin Woolley, and who lived and died as a faithful member of the church, told me of a time when she was a young girl, when she went to Bountiful Stake conference at the Bountiful tabernacle with her grandfather John W. Woolley. This was sometime after John Woolley's excommunication. Joseph F. Smith had spoken at the meeting, and there were two doors leaving the building, which were separated from each other by a little distance. After the meeting John Woolley started going out of the one door and Joseph F. Smith hurriedly went out of the other door so as not to be seen with John Woolley, and met him on the steps outside of the tabernacle. Joseph F. Smith apologized to John W. Woolley about his excommunication and told him that he had talked to the Twelve, and that they had consented for John W. Woolley to be rebaptized, but that it would have to be done in secret. John Woolley responded by saying, that they had cut him off in public and if they were not willing to restore him in public, then don't bother — in other words, thanks, but no thanks.

What ever may or may not be the truth about the ordination of five men in 1886, it would appear that it was never mentioned

---

Olive related another account of this same incident in a recorded interview which she had with Rhea A. Kunz, on 13 June 1971:

Olive Woolley Coombs: You might be talking about President Joseph F. Smith when he came out of the tabernacle at Bountiful. I was a child of seven — I well remember my age. Daddy had taken me over to the Stake Conference in Bountiful. We had taken Grandfather with us. They had disfellowshipped Grandfather before this time. That didn't stop Grandfather from paying his tithing. It didn't stop Grandfather from going to Church. It didn't stop Grandfather from preaching the Gospel. It didn't stop Grandfather from knowing that the Lord lived and that Jesus Christ's Gospel was the right Gospel. It didn't stop him from any of this. Father and I were standing in front of the Tabernacle after the meeting, waiting for Grandfather to come out. He liked to say Hello to this one and that one. Joseph F. Smith was the General Authority present at that conference. He walked up to us just as Grandfather walked up and Pres. Smith put his arm around Grandfather's arm and said, "John, I'm very sorry about what has been done [i.e. John Woolley's excommunication]. I want you to know ***it wasn't my will***. It was voted [by the Twelve]. But I have the assurance [of the Twelve] that if you will come back into the Church secretly we [i.e. the Twelve] are ready and willing."

And he (Grandfather) said, "I appreciate that very much, but since I was taken out publicly, the way you must take me back is publicly, because I feel I have done no wrong; and my Lord, I'm sure, agrees with me." That was all there was to it, but it was quite a thing to a little kid standing there. (Rhea A. Kumz, *Reminiscences of John W. Woolley and Lorin C. Woolley* Vol. 1: 8)

In this regard it is significant that John Woolley had received his Second Anointing, which sealing cannot be revoked save for committing the sin against the Holy Ghost or shedding innocent blood. So according to Wilford Woodruff, Woolley's Priesthood blessings were secure anyway, and this too, notwithstanding the public proclamations of certain impudent brethren, who, in actuality, were out of harmony with the President of the Church.

Wilford Woodruff used his sealing and Second Anointing as a doctrinal argument that the Lord would take his life or remove him out of his place, before He would allow Woodruff to do wrong or lead the Church astray. Woodruff used this argument to assure the people that he did not do wrong in signing the Manifesto. If we apply this same doctrine to John Woolley, then it would mean that everything that John W. Woolley did with regard to performing late plural marriages was right in the sight of the Lord. Of course this was true anyway, if for no other reason than simply because ultimately it was Joseph F. Smith who was behind it all in the first place.

even by Lorin Woolley until 1922. Yet without a doubt, John W. Woolley was doing plural marriages at least as early as 1913. Not only so, but even after his excommunication, he still felt that his authority continued, for he continued to perform plural marriages for individuals who came to him until his death in 1928. The apparent fact that the ordination of five men by President Taylor was never mentioned until many years after John W. Woolley's involvement in performing plural marriages, would argue hard for the idea that John W. Woolley claimed his authority through another line. It would also indicate that the idea of the John Taylor appointments was an after thought of Lorin Woolley, which was adopted by him for better polemics against the hardened leaders of the Church.[32] The fantastic claims to authority coming miraculously from President John Taylor would be a far more effective tool than a mere appointment from President Joseph F. Smith, especially in view of the fact that the whole commission from President Smith was entered into under the most solemn covenant of secrecy, all of which was necessary in order to protect the Church against further harassment from the Government, and its President against aspiring powers from within.

That John W. Woolley received the necessary ordination for authority to perform Eternal Marriages cannot be disputed. On October 4th, 1886, he entered into plural marriage by marrying

---

[32]Lorin attempts to explain his apparent loss of memory regarding the appointment of five men in his statement where he states President Taylor said that "many of the things he had told us we would forget and they would be taken from us, but that they would return to us in due time as needed, and from this fact we would know that the same was from the Lord." (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* p. 8) I question the legitimacy of this argument. How can the Lord deprive a man of his memory and at the same time call him to act as a witness. Nevertheless, others high in authority have made similar statements. President Young once stated that he had similar experiences with his memory during his reconstruction of the Temple Ceremony. There were things which the Prophet Joseph Smith had taught which President Young had forgotten, but when it came time for him to organize and systematize the ordinances of the Temple, those things which he had forgotten were restored to his memory.

the widowed mother of B. H. Roberts. Shortly afterwards, he and his wife went into town to receive their Second Anointing.[33] Hence only one week after the 1886 meeting was supposed to have taken place, John W. Woolley was given all the Keys of the Priesthood. Through this ordinance he received an ordination to the Fullness of the Priesthood, which included the Sealing Keys of Elijah. Years later he became a temple worker in the Salt Lake Temple, where he was commissioned by President Joseph F. Smith to use his Priesthood in performing Eternal Marriages. In 1910 he married a third wife. In 1911 he was called to be the Patriarch of Davis County Stake, for the express purpose of replacing Patriarch Judson Toleman, who only shortly before had been excommunicated for performing plural marriages. In the years that followed John W. Woolley together with many other Patriarchs would also be excommunicated for the same offense. It was these "Patriarchs" to whom Heber J. Grant referred, when in his April 1921 Conference address he made the following remarks:

> We have excommunicated several patriarchs because they arrogated unto themselves, the right, or pretended right, to perform these ceremonies, and after our having excommunicated several patriarchs, another one, so I am informed, has committed the same offense. I announce to all Israel that no living man has the right to perform plural marriages. I announce that no patriarch has the right to perform any marriages at all in the Church. (*Conference Reports*, April 1921, p. 202)

Isn't it strange that so many Patriarchs should suddenly get the idea that they had the right to perform plural marriages? It would make one wonder what important individual this novel idea came from.[34] Certainly it must have been someone with considerable influ-

---

[33]Max Anderson is the source of my information on John W. Woolley receiving his Second Anointing shortly after he married B. H. Robert's mother, which would have been early in October 1886. Max told me this in 1979, while I was working on the review of his book, however as with anything else which might support the Woolley story, he is now unwilling to share the source of his information.

[34]As can be seen from his inaugural address, President Joseph F. Smith had special ideas about the office of Church and Stake Patriarchs and as with other

ence, as the idea had spread through the whole body of Patriarchs in the Church.[35] J. Reuben Clark tactfully admitted that President Joseph F. Smith had appointed these Patriarchs to perpetuate plural marriage in the following statement which he wrote in the hope of having it presented in the October 1923 Conference:

Resolved that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, in Solemn conference assembled, hereby reaffirms the rule and order of the Church as it has always heretofore existed and as it does now exist, namely that *all delegated keys, powers, and/or authorities cease and determine, and become of no force, value, or efficacy whatsoever, upon the death of the*

---

things, early Fundamentalist literature would indicate that originally they shared with him these same views. (*Conference Reports* 1901, Special Conference Nov. 10, 1901, pp. 71–72; *Truth* magazine Vol. 5:183, 208; 9:66; 11:105–106; 14:33, 45, 46, 165–166; 17:182, 183).

In coming to understand Fundamentalist beginnings, the affinity and love of early Fundamentalist leaders for Joseph F. Smith, as contrasted with the bad feelings which were mutually held between them and Heber J. Grant needs to be explained. Be it remembered that even during the administration of President Joseph F. Smith, there were times when it became necessary to excommunicate certain individuals who had entered Plural Marriage and who had been exposed. Even great men such as Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley were offered up as scapegoats in order to protect the Church for its post Manifesto involvement in plural marriage. Not only this, but Joseph F. Smith also made strong public pronouncements against the late practice of entering into plural marriage, just as did Heber J. Grant. Yet notwithstanding this, for some reason early Fundamentalist leaders still loved Joseph F. Smith, while they despised Grant. The reason for this was because they knew that Joseph F. Smith was their friend, and that out of necessity he was leading a double life. They knew that his public pronouncements were made for public consumption, but that privately he held other feelings, and that he was involved in other activities — and activities too with which they were personally acquainted. This is in contrast to President Grant, who by the time he became President was intent on terminating the practice of plural marriage altogether — and who in every sense of the word, rather than being their friend, was actually their mortal enemy, who would even go so far as to use his influence with State officials to have them put in prison for their persistence in plural marriage.

[35]In an interview which I had in 1979, Price Johnson told me that there was a Patriarch appointed in every Stake of the Church to perform Plural Marriages for worthy individuals.

person making the delegation thereof, and that all ordinances, sealings, bindings, promises, or other acts whatsoever made, done or performed under and pursuant to such delegated keys, powers, and/or authorities and made, done, or performed *after the death of the person who made the delegation, as null, void, and of no efficacy* or effect whatsoever . . . . (*J. Reuben Clark The Church Years* <1983> by D. Michael Quinn, p. 182)

As D. Michael Quinn explained it in Clark's biography:

[Clark's] proposed statement *sidestepped the historical issue* of whether *or not any Presidents* of the Church prior to Heber J. Grant had authorized the performance of plural marriages after 1890 and instead argued that any such *delegated authority ended with the death of the Church President involved*.

In continuing, Quinn observed that:

President Heber J. Grant was too outraged with the people who continued to perform and contract plural marriages for him to give much notice to a lawyer's [i.e. Clark's] unsolicited legalisms (*J. Reuben Clark The Church Years* 182)

PRESIDENT HEBER J. GRANT AND "THE ONE ANOINTED AND APPOINTED"

President Grant's contempt and impudent disregard for the Law of God, and the will of his predecessor is clearly portrayed by his actions. Certainly, in accordance with the Law of the Priesthood, this fact would weigh heavily against him ever being honored by God as "the one anointed and appointed".[36] That this is so is explicitly stated in the very same revelation which called Grant to be an Apostle in the quorum of the Twelve. Consider the following:

Thus saith the Lord to the Twelve, and to the Priesthood and people of my Church: Let my servants George Teasdale and ***Heber J. Grant*** be

[36]D&C 132:7

appointed to fill the vacancies in the Twelve . . . and then proceed to fill up the presiding quorum of Seventies . . . . You may appoint Seymour B. Young to fill up the vacancy in the presiding quorum of Seventies, ***if he will conform to my law****: For it is not meet that men who will not abide my law shall preside over my Priesthood . . . . . .* for my Priesthood whom I have called and whom I have sustained and honored, *shall honor me and obey my laws, and the laws of my Holy Priesthood,* ***or they shall not be considered worthy*** *to hold my Priesthood*, saith the Lord. And let my Priesthood humble themselves before me, and *seek not their own will but my will; For if my Priesthood . . . do not acknowledge me* ***I will not acknowledge them***, saith the Lord; *for I will be honored and obeyed by my Priesthood.* (*UPR* Vol. 1, 83: <13 October 1882> 1–5, 15–17; see also 82: <June or July 1882> 14–15, 33; 81: <27 June 1882> 24–29, 46)

The following day after receiving this revelation, President Taylor called a meeting and presented it to the First Presidency, the Quorum of the Twelve and the Presidents of Stakes. The following are Wilford Woodruff's minutes:

We held a meeting with the Presidency, Twelve Apostles and the Presidents of Stakes. Remarks were made by President Taylor. Then the Revelation was read. G. Q. Cannon spoke to us and said *how can we teach the people any law or principle that we do not keep ourselves?* Joseph F. Smith spoke upon several subjects upon the Patriarchal order of Marriage. President Taylor told what Joseph Smith said to him upon that subject & said *if we do not embrace that principle soon* ***the Keys will be turned against us*** for *if we do not keep the same law that our Heavenly Father has we cannot go with him.* ***The word of the Lord to us*** was that *if we did not obey that Law we could not go where our Heavenly Father dwells. A man obeying a lower law* ***is not qualified to preside over those who keep a higher law***.

W. Woodruff said he was glad the Quorum of the Twelve & Seventies was now to be filled and said that *the reason why the Church & Kingdom of God could not progress if we did not receive the Patriarchal Law of Marriage was that* ***it belonged to this dispensation***[37] as well as the Baptism

---

[37]Nearly six years later on May 17th, 1888, President Woodruff made another statement in the Manti Temple, wherein he affirmed that: *"We are not going*

for the Dead and any law or ordinance that belongs to this dispensation ***must be received by the members of the Church*** *or it cannot progress*. ***The leading men of Israel*** who are presiding over Stakes *will have to obey the Law of Abraham*[38] ***or they will have to stop***.[39] (*Wilford Woodruff's Journal* 8: <14 Oct. 1882> 126)

---

to stop the practice of plural marriage ***until the coming of the Son of Man****."* (Diary of Apostle Heber J. Grant, May 17th, 1888, as cited in *Church, State, and Politics: The Diaries of John Henry Smith*, edited by Jean Bickmore White <1990> 200–201)

Apostle John Henry Smith was also present and has left us the following record of this occasion in his diary:

Thursday, May 17, 1888 — Manti

"The following brethren met to have prayers at 10 A.M. in the Temple: Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, F. D. Richards, George Q. Cannon, Brigham Young, F. M. Lyman, H. J. Grant, D. H. Wells, John Smith, Jacob Gates, S. B. Young, John Morgan, Kanute Peterson, W. H. Fulsom, Jon. Sharp, A. H. Lund, D. D. McArthur, W. S. Snow, E. L. Parry, R. Campbell, J. B. Maiben, Henry Beal, Jas. G. Bleak, C. Wilkin, J. D. T. McAllister, W. S. Farnsworth, George Reynolds, A. Winters.

"B. Young prayed and the following brethren met in the circle, Bro. George Q. Cannon being mouth: Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, F. D. Richards, G. Q. Cannon, B. Young, F. M. Lyman, H. J. Grant, D. H. Wells, Jacob Gates, S. B. Young, John Morgan, J. D. T. McAllister, D. D. McArther, J. G. Bleak, M. F. Farnsworth, Kanute Peterson, Henry Beal, J. B. Maiben, A. H. Lund, George Reynolds, C. H. Wilkin and myself.

"12 noon we met and after singing President Wilford Woodruff [gave] the Dedicatory Prayer. After which we shouted three times, Hosanna to God and the Lamb. Bro. Woodruff spoke a few words. Lorenzo Snow spoke. Bro. Geo. Q. Cannon talked very nicely, also B. Young.

"Bro. Woodruff spoke a few words again, among them he said ["]*We won't quit practicing Plural Marriage* ***until Christ shall come****."* F. M. Lyman spoke very nicely. President Woodruff dismissed us by prayer." (Church, State, and Politics: the Diaries of John Henry Smith, edited by Jean Bickmore White <1990> 200–201; For other sources on this see *Utah Historical Quarterly* 39: <Fall 1971> 359; The original manuscript is presently housed in Special Collections at the University of Utah Library)

[38]"The law of Abraham" is a phrase which comes from the Prophet Joseph Smith's 1843 revelation on Marriage, where it is used in the context of Plural Marriage in the New and Everlasting Covenant:

"I am the Lord thy God, and will give unto thee the law of my Holy Priesthood, as was ordained by me and my Father before the world was. Abraham

received all things, whatsoever he received, by revelation and commandment, by my word, saith the Lord, and hath entered into his exaltation and sitteth upon his throne. Abraham received promises concerning his seed, and of the fruit of his loins — from whose loins ye are, namely, my servant Joseph — which were to continue so long as they were in the world; and as touching Abraham and his seed, out of the world they should continue; both in the world and out of the world should they continue as innumerable as the stars; or, if ye were to count the sand upon the seashore ye could not number them. This promise is yours also, because ye are of Abraham, and the promise was made unto Abraham; and by this law is the continuation of the works of my Father, wherein he glorifieth himself. Go ye, therefore, *and do* ***the works of Abraham****; enter ye into my law* and ye shall be saved. But if ye enter not into my law ye cannot receive the promise of my Father, which he made unto Abraham. God commanded Abraham, and Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife. And why did she do it? *Because this was the law"* (D&C 132:28 – 34)

After the Prophet's death and for many years afterwards, these passages were often referred to and discussed by President Young, John Taylor and the other members of the Twelve and First Presidency, all of whom understood "the law of Abraham" as given in the above revelation to refer to having more than one wife in the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage. The following are two examples of such statements:

Brigham Young: "Monogamy, or restrictions by law to one wife, is no part of the economy of Heaven among men. Such a system was commenced by the founders of the Roman empire. That empire was founded on the banks of the Tiber by wandering brigands. When these robbers founded the city of Rome, it was evident to them that their success in attaining a balance of power with their neighbors, depended upon introducing females into their body politic, so they stole them from the Sabines, who were near neighbors. The scarcity of women gave existence to laws restricting one wife to one man. Rome became the mistress of the world, and introduced this order of monogamy wherever her sway was acknowledged. Thus this monogamic order of marriage, so esteemed by modern Christians as a holy sacrament and divine institution, is nothing but a system established by a set of robbers.

"The Congress of the United States have lately passed a law to punish polygamy in the Territories of the United States and in other places over which they have exclusive jurisdiction. In doing this, they have undertaken to dictate the Almighty in his revelations to his people, and those who handle edged tools, unless they are skillful, are apt to cut their fingers; and those who hand out insult to the Great I Am, in the end, are apt to get more than they have spoken for.

"Why do we believe in and practice polygamy? Because the Lord introduced it to his servants in a revelation given to Joseph Smith, and the Lord's servants

have always practiced it. "And is that religion popular in heaven?" It is the only popular religion there, for this is the religion of Abraham and, *unless we do the works of Abraham*, we are not Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise. (*Journal of Discourses* Vol. 9: <July 6, 1862> 322)

Franklin D. Richards: "The Latter-day Saints claim to be the children of Abraham, and if they are the children of Abraham, they will do the works of Abraham. It was difficult for men and women from all parts of the world, who had lived in the monogamic order all their lives to accept this doctrine of the eternity and plurality of marriage. It was "a new and everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned, saith the Lord." This was the obligation that was laid upon the Prophet Joseph, and through him, upon the true believers of the Church, even all who were worthy to accept of these obligations. It was herein that the Elders and their wives extended their faith, enlarged their obedience, and accepted the terms of the new and everlasting covenant extending not through time only, but eternity also." (*Journal of Discourses* Vol. 26: <October 1885> 341)

In keeping with this same doctrine, in 1886, when under great pressure both within and without the Church to relinquish Plural Marriage, President Taylor went to the Lord and inquired "concerning the New and Everlasting Covenant and how far it is binding upon my people." Among other things, in responding, the Lord revealed the following:

"I the Lord do not change and my word and my covenants and my law do not. And as I have heretofore said by my servant Joseph all those who would enter into my glory must and shall obey my law. And have I not commanded men that if they were Abraham's seed and would enter into my glory they must do ***the works of Abraham***. *I have not revoked this law* ***nor will I*** for it is everlasting and those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof, even so Amen." (*UPR* 88:1, 6–9)

[39]That this edict became Church policy is demonstrated three years later in the case of Bishop John Sharp. The following review of this case is taken from an article which was written by James Allen, and published in the *Utah Historical Quarterly*:

On September 29, 1885, Mormon Bishop Hiram B. Clawson joined his son, Rudger, as a convict in the Utah Territorial Penitentiary. Both were imprisoned for violating a constitutional law of the land — the law against plural marriage. But before going to prison Bishop Clawson expressed no regrets for what he had done. "To me there are only two courses. One is prison and honor, the other is liberty and dishonor." (*Deseret News*, September 29, 1885)

Two days later another Mormon bishop, John Sharp, sat before the Salt Lake Stake High Council. Because he had recently decided to obey the law of the land

by giving up plural marriage, and to counsel others to do so, he was required to resign his bishopric. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 7, 1885)

* * * * * *

The judicial crusade of the 1880s created a garrison attitude among the Saints. They defended the principle of plural marriage with stepped-up fervor, and for a short time the number of new plural marriages actually increased. After prosecution began under the Edmunds Act, more than a thousand judgments were imposed for unlawful cohabitation. In addition, otherwise law-abiding citizens took up residence on the underground — that is, went into hiding to escape prosecution. Among these were the First Presidency of the church and most of the Council of the Twelve Apostles. Those who served time in prison suffered great indignity for conscience' sake and became heroes in the eyes of their coreligionists. The Saints gave the impression of presenting a solid front, but within the ranks there were differing perspectives on what their obligations ultimately must be. The stories of Rudger Clawson and Bishop John Sharp bring that issue into dynamic focus. . . . . .

On November 3, 1884, young Clawson received his sentence. What passed between judge and convict on that day brought into sharp focus the conflicting attitudes toward civil disobedience. When asked to show cause why judgment should not be pronounced, the prisoner simply stated:

I very much regret that the laws of my country should come in contact with the laws of God, but whenever they do I shall invariably choose the latter. If I did not so express myself I should feel unworthy of the cause I represent . . . . The law of 1862 and the Edmunds Law were expressly designed to operate against marriage as practiced and believed in by the Latter-day Saints. They are therefore unconstitutional, and of course cannot command the respect that a constitutional law would. That is all I have to say, your honor. (An account of the trial and conviction is in Whitney, *History of Utah* 3:293–319, see p. 318 for above citation; *Deseret News*, November 3, 1884)

The judge seemed surprised and, leaning back in his chair, meditated for more than a minute before he replied. He denied that the Constitution protected the practice of polygamy and declared,

While all men have a right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and to entertain any religious belief that their conscience and judgment might reasonably dictate, they have not the right to engage in a practice which the American people, through the laws of their country, declare to be unlawful and injurious to society. (Whitney, *History of Utah* 3:318; *Deseret News*, April 25, 1884; November 3, 1884)

The Judge would have been more lenient, he said, if Clawson had not openly declared that he believed it right to violate the law. The resulting sentence was

three and a half years in prison and a $500 fine for polygamy, plus another six months and $300 for unlawful cohabitation.

So Rudger Clawson marched off to prison, one of many heroes among the Saints because, like Paul of old, he was incarcerated for conscience' sake. . . . . He was released on December 12, 1887, having served just over three years. Within two weeks he was made president of the Box Elder Stake . . . . .

In contrast to Rudger Clawson, John Sharp was ill and aging when his case arose in 1885. He was nearly sixty-four, and his impressive life story made it impossible to predict that when confronted with a choice he would act differently from the hundreds of Saints who went to prison for conscience' sake. . . . . .

Whatever his reason, on September 18[, 1885,] Bishop Sharp and his attorney walked into Judge Zane's court and changed his plea to guilty. The ailing bishop's lawyer then read a short but important statement, prepared by Sharp himself, explaining his position: "I hold myself amenable to the laws of my country, and in whatever degree I may have infringed upon the provisions thereof, am ready to meet the penalty." He explained, in words as loyal to the principle of plural marriage as those of any other Mormon stalwart, that he had entered polygamy in good faith, believing it to be the law of God, and that the Edmunds Act was a harsh law. Nevertheless, he had arranged his family relations to conform with the requirements of the law (meaning that he had arranged for separate maintenance for his wives) and that he was now living in harmony with the provisions against cohabitation. "It is my intention to do so," he said, "until an overruling Providence shall decree greater religious toleration in the land." He was then questioned briefly by the judge and promised that henceforth he would obey the law of the land as interpreted by the courts. (*Deseret News*, September 19, 1885; *Salt Lake Tribune*, September 19, 1885)

To Judge Zane this was one of the choice opportunities he had been waiting for. Several months earlier another prominent Mormon, Orson P. Arnold, had become the first to take the same step, and the judge had fined him $300 but had not imposed a prison sentence. (Whitney, *History of Utah* 3:357–59) Others followed, and all were criticized by their brethren. Bishop Sharp, however, was the most prominent of them all, and his example, Zane reasoned, would help to persuade others to do the same. It "will have a more beneficial effect on society than any imprisonment would have," he said and imposed a $300 fine but no prison sentence.

The Saints in Salt Lake City were, for the most part, shocked and dismayed at the action of Bishop Sharp and, like a sudden thunderstorm, their words of disapproval descended upon him in torrents. Sharp visited the office of the *Deseret News* to ask for a merciful tone in the report of his case, but his own ward member, John Nicholson, acting editor who would soon go to prison himself for polygamy, considered him a mere compromiser trying to maintain his influence among rail-

road men. (As reported by George Cannon Lambert, "Journal of George Cannon Lambert," in Kate B. Carter, ed., *Heart Throbs of the West* 12 vols., Vol. 9: <Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1939–51> 364) The first editorial on the subject declared that Sharp had missed the "one opportunity of his life" to sustain a principle he believed to be divine, criticized him severely for agreeing to obey the law according to the interpretation of the court, and held that in spite of his precarious health and the fact that "incarceration in prison might have proved disastrous, if not fatal, to him," he was totally wrong to acquiesce.

No matter how dark the clouds that are now apparently frowning upon the people of God, the good ship Zion will weather the storm. It may rage for a season, after which the turbulent waters will subside. Meanwhile there must be, of what God has given to the Saints, no surrender. (*Deseret News*, September 19, 1885)

This was only the beginning. Brigham Young, Jr. reflecting the sentiment of many churchmen, recorded in his diary: "To my understanding he rejected in total the doctrine of celestial marriage." (Brigham Young Jr. Journal, September 19, 1885, LDS Archives) The *Ogden Daily Herald* declared that Sharp had lost the grand opportunity of his lifetime. (September 21, 1885) Heber J. Grant refused to comment on Sharp's action publicly, but he wrote to Joseph F. Smith, "Regarding Bishop Sharp and others I must say that I cannot find words to express my regrets at their action." (*Salt Lake Tribune*, September 19, 1885; Grant to Smith, November 6, 1885, Heber J. Grant Letterbooks, LDS Archives) Smith, in turn, wrote to George Q. Cannon from Hawaii,

I am truly sorry for Br. John Sharp . . . . I can see no way for him but repentance, and a full acknowledgement of his error and a full return to the responsibilities devolved upon him by reason of the covenants he has made. This would no doubt be hard to do, perhaps impossible for him now, but it would be to me a thousand times preferable to the "humble pie" upon which he now feeds . . . . Truly the material of which martyrs were made in olden times has become very scarce in these latter days in the civilized world. (Smith to Cannon, November 12, 1885, Joseph F. Smith Letterbooks, LDS Archives) . . . . . .

In desenting from the dissenters, Sharp found his church position affected. . . . .

His immediate superior, Salt Lake Stake President Angus M. Cannon, was even then serving time in the penitentiary for the very offense for which Sharp escaped imprisonment. Cannon had sought to conform to the spirit of the law, as he understood it, by providing separate apartments for his plural wives and by not actually living with them in a connubial sense. He visited them in the daytime, sometimes ate meals with them, but scrupulously refrained from normal husband-wife relationships. This, he believed, would save him from being convicted of unlawful cohabitation. Judge Zane thought differently, and Cannon was convicted and sentenced on May 9, 1885, to the usual six months in prison and $300 fine.

Cannon appealed to the United States Supreme Court on the grounds that unlawful cohabitation had been wrongly defined by Judge Zane, but the Supreme Court upheld the Utah judge. Cannon was released from prison on December 14, 1885, and immediately went into hiding to avoid a threatened rearrest on similar charges. (See discussion of this case in Whitney, *History of Utah*, 3:334–39, 357–58, 363–72, 388–89, 392–94. See the Supreme Court decision in 116 U.S. 55. Cannon actually spent an extra two months, voluntarily, in prison in order to have his appeal tested in the Supreme Court.)

Sharp's stake leaders could hardly be expected to show much leniency under the circumstances. Indeed, they were still preaching that plural marriage was essential to salvation and were intensely critical of those who would bend in the least degree. In May, before he went to prison, Angus Cannon had stated in a stake conference that "when a man professing to be a Latter-day Saint will cower before our enemies and beg for mercy, forgetting or renouncing the promises of God, he considered him a contemptible hypocrite." In a stake priesthood meeting in October a speaker declared from the pulpit that no faithful man would submit even though prison stared him in the face and that any priesthood holder who failed to sustain the law of God (that is, polygamy) forfeited his right to rule in the midst of his people. (Salt Lake Stake, "Historical Record, 1880–1890," May 1, 1885, pp. 422–33; October 3, 1885, p. 457, LDS Archives). It was even being preached in the stake that people must be firm believers in plural marriage before they could obtain recommends to participate in the Mormon temple ceremonies. In one instance a man went to the Logan Temple wanting to have a dead woman sealed to him. He was denied the privilege because he had only one wife even though he had had ample opportunity to obtain another. A bishop from the Salt Lake Stake who was a polygamist was allowed to have the dead woman sealed to him. (Salt Lake Stake, "Historical Record, 1880–1890," pp. 470–71, LDS Archives)

Five days after his court appearance, Bishop Sharp was called in by Joseph E. Taylor, acting president of the Salt Lake Stake. The bishop, along with his son James, talked with Taylor for nearly two hours. Earlier, Taylor had requested in writing that Sharp cease functioning as a bishop until the matter was settled, and in this interview he asked Sharp to resign. Sharp refused, and that night Taylor reported at length to the high council, suggesting that Sharp be called in to justify himself. The council agreed. (Salt Lake Stake High Council Minutes, 1882–1887, September 23, and October 1, 1885, pp. 652, 657–65, LDS Archives) On September 29 the council again discussed Bishop Sharp's intransigence . . . . . The council voted to summon Bishop Sharp on the evening of October 1.

It was a long night. Taylor reviewed in detail his conversation with John and James Sharp on September 23. Bishop Sharp then spoke from what must have been a deeply emotional and difficult position for him, attempting to counteract the barrage of accusations directed toward him. . . . . .

We see in the above a clear cut interpretation of the revelation which President Taylor received the day previous, and this too, not only as it was understood by President Taylor, but also by George Q. Cannon, Joseph F. Smith and Wilford Woodruff. You will notice President Taylor warned the leaders of the Church that if they did not "soon" embrace the Principle and practice of Plural Marriage, the Keys would be turned against them. The 1890 Manifesto, ***as interpreted*** *by Heber J. Grant*, bears witness to the fact that ultimately the Church chose to obey wicked men rather than God, and that President Taylor's foreboding regarding the loss of the Keys came to be fulfilled in the person of Heber J. Grant. An editorial published in the *Deseret Evening News* on April 23rd, 1885 perfectly expresses President Taylor's sentiments as given above:

The council's discussion then turned to whether John Sharp should resign as bishop. Sharp saw no reason to resign, for in his mind he had done nothing to deny the faith. Taylor, on the other hand, contrasted Sharp's action with that of Bishop Hiram B. Clawson who had refused to do as Sharp had done, that is, "promise to live within the law as construed by the courts." As a result, Clawson and his wives and family had been insulted in open court. Furthermore, Taylor reminded the council, "The President of this Stake, Bro. Angus M. Cannon, is now suffering imprisonment for doing exactly the opposite to that which the Bishop has done." In Taylor's view, once Sharp had given his pledge to counsel others to obey the law he could not properly serve in the capacity of a bishop, for he must counsel people against what the church considered right. Finally . . . . ***Taylor reminded him of a revelation recently received by John Taylor that included the words, "For it is not meet that men who will not abide my law shall preside over My priesthood***." . . . . . He then announced that John Sharp had rendered himself ineligible to retain his office as bishop of the Twentieth Ward. A vote was taken, and ten members of the council voted to sustain the decision while three, John Rumel, Hosea Stout, and John T. Caine, abstained. Sharp asked to have the matter referred to the First Presidency — which the council agreed to do . . . .

A transcript of John Sharp's hearing was sent to the First Presidency . . . . . On November 3, 1885, the First Presidency officially sustained the action of the Salt Lake Stake in requiring John Sharp to resign as bishop. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 7, 1885; Salt Lake Stake High Council Minutes, 1882–1887, November 10, 1885, p. 709) . . . . . ("'Good Guys' Vs. 'Good Guys': Rudger Clawson, John Sharp, and Civil Disobedience in Nineteenth Century Utah", by James B. Allen, *Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Spring 1980> 148–171)

What would be necessary to bring about the result nearest the hearts of the opponents of 'Mormonism' more properly termed the Gospel of the Son of God? *Simply to renounce, abrogate or apostatize from the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage* ***in its fullness***. *Were the church to do that as an entirety,* ***God would reject the Saints as a body***. *The authority of the Priesthood* ***would be withdrawn***, with its gifts and powers, and there would be *no more heavenly recognition of* ***the ministrations among the people***. The heavens would permanently withdraw themselves, and *the Lord would raise up another people of greater valor* and stability, for his work must, according to his unalterable decrees, go forward (*Deseret News* April 23, 1885)

Twenty nine years earlier, President Heber C. Kimball made another similar declaration, wherein he prophetically warned the Saints of impending consequences if they should turn away from the Practice of Plural Marriage:

You might as well deny "Mormonism," and turn away from it, as to oppose the plurality of wives. *Let the* ***Presidency of this Church****, and the* ***Twelve Apostles****,* and ***all the authorities*** *unite and say with one voice that they will oppose that doctrine,* ***and the whole of them would be damned***. What are you opposing it for? It is a principle that God has revealed for the salvation of the human family. He revealed it to Joseph the Prophet in this our dispensation; *and that which He revealed* ***He designs to have carried out*** *by His people*. (*JD* 5:203–204)

It would seem both providential and Prophetic that the very same revelation which called Heber J. Grant to the Apostleship, should also set forth the Law of the Priesthood upon which he should be damned in future years! Surely if there were to be any revelation that Grant would feel obligated to honor, it would be the one which called him to office as an Apostle and which set the machine in motion for him to become the President of the Church.

In President Grant's April 1921 conference address he made the following statement:

Perhaps I owe an apology — in fact I will make one — *for speaking with anger in this building last Sunday night*. As I came to the meeting

Sunday night, I was told that a person had said that neither Heber J. Grant nor any other man had any right to say that an individual could not perform a plural marriage; that God had revealed plural marriages, and therefore that I had no right to say that they could not be performed, and that one party had remarked that it would take an angel from heaven to convince him, even if I did say it. . . . . I had just heard that one more pretended plural marriage had been performed, and after all the teachings from this stand, and all the declarations, and after excommunicating, as we have done, within the last year, one man for marrying — or pretending to marry — a plural wife, I confess I was angry and "rebuked with sharpness."

But I want to say to the Latter day Saints that ***no man upon the face of the earth*** *has any right or any authority to perform a plural marriage, and there are no plural marriages today in the Church of Christ*, because ***no human being*** *has the right to perform them.*[40] Therefore, any person pretending to have that right is attempting to exercise an authority that he does not have, and therefore he does not perform a marriage and there is no marriage covenant when such ceremonies are performed. (*Conference Reports* 1921, pp. 201–202)

Grant clearly and unequivocally states that: "no man upon the face of the earth has any right or any authority to perform a plural

---

[40]This statement is a flat contradiction to the Prophecies regarding this Dispensation. According to the Scriptures and the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith, this was the "Dispensation of the Fulness of Times", wherein all things were to be restored, never again to be taken away, and of necessity this would include both the belief in and practice of Plural Marriage:

"All the ordinances and duties that ever have been required by the Priesthood, under the directions and commandments of the Almighty in any of the dispensations, *shall all be had in the last dispensation*, therefore *all things had under the authority of the Priesthood at any former period, shall be had again*, bringing to pass the restoration spoken of by the mouth of all the Holy Prophets." (*TPJS* 171–172)

"we are the favored people that God has made choice of to bring about the Latter-day glory; it is left for us to see, participate in and help roll forward the Latter-day glory, "the Dispensation of the Fulness of Times, when God will gather together *all things that are in Heaven, and all things that are upon the earth.*" "even in one" (*TPJS* 231; For more on this subject see, "The Church of the Firstborn and the Holy Order of God", *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 1: <Jan 1977> 11–14)

marriage". While it is true that Grant was not in an authoritative position to speak for others who had received the power, certainly we must admit that in his own personal case, he was in a position to speak for himself, and that on this occasion, insofar as it pertained to himself, he told the Truth. Inasmuch as President Grant was then living upon the Earth, we should suppose that his statement that 'no living man upon the earth had the authority' would of necessity include himself. We can therefore take this as a direct affirmation from President Grant, that he did not have the authority to minister in the ordinance of Plural Marriage, and could not therefore have been "the one anointed and appointed".[41] Thus we

---

[41]Inasmuch as the sealing power which is needed in order to perform sealings for monogamous and polygamous marriages is precisely one and the same, it is difficult to understand how you can honestly interpret Grant's statement in any other way. The fact that the Priesthood authority which is required for the sealing of a Monogamous or Plural Marriage is identical or the same, was testified to by Presidents John Taylor and George Q. Cannon at the trial of Rudger Clawson on October 17, 1884. (See *Deseret News*, October 18th, 1884; see also *Solemn Covenant — the Mormon Polygamous passage* 53) This being the case, Grant's statement can be taken as a confession that not only did he lack the authority to seal plural marriages, but he also lacked authority to seal monogamous marriages as well.

We do well to remember that the whole calling and purpose of the "one anointed and appointed" is to bestow Celestial blessings upon Father Adam's worthy children (*TPJS* 322) — not to curse and deny them simply for the sake of friendship with the world and the caprices of a Satanic Government, such as Grant was doing. Indeed, rather than blessing the People, Grant had become an adder in the path. He himself would not enter, and others who would, he hindered:

"Woe unto you, Lawyers [J. Reuben Clark and Heber J. Grant]! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." (Luke 11:52)

"Oh Ye pollutions, ye hypocrites, ye teachers, who sell yourselves for that which will canker, ***why have you polluted*** *the Holy Church of God?* Why are ye ashamed to take upon you the name of Christ? Why do ye not think that greater is the value of an endless happiness than that misery which never dies — because of the praise of the world?" (Mormon 8:38)

"When men are called unto mine everlasting gospel, and covenant with an everlasting covenant, they are accounted as the salt of the earth and the savior

of men; They are called to be the savor of men; therefore, if that salt of the earth lose its savor, behold, it is thenceforth good for nothing only to be cast out and trodden under the feet of men." (D&C 101:39–40)

As Hales has pointed out, Joseph W. Musser wrote in his diary that he did not know who held or presided in the Keys of the Priesthood. The following are the entries from his diary:

Monday [November] 2nd. [1936]: . . . . . In evening we held a testimony meeting . . . . . I testified that John Y. Barlow at Short Creek was a servant of the Lord and was doing a good work. *Told the Saints if they wanted to know who the one that held the* ***keys to priesthood*** *was, to put themselves in tune with the Spirit of the Lord, and ask the Lord for the information; that if He wanted them to know, they would find out; but not to worry. The Priesthood is on the earth and [will] remain here*. A very enjoyable time was held.

Thursday [November 12, 1936]: Louis [A. Kelsch] and I had a personal talk with Bro. John Y. Barlow. We pointed out our fears that under the present set-up the group could not prosper; that there seemed a disposition toward a one man rule; that many of the Saints were complaining; that the present arrangement was not in accordance with the spirit of the action of the Priesthood recently taken, whereby it was advised that Bro. Barlow resign from the management of the affairs of the group and confine his labors more particularly to the spiritual field; that our work was especially along the line of keeping faith in patriarchal marriage alive, and not in the directing of colonizing. *Bro. Barlow was asked* ***if he claimed to hold the keys of Priesthood, which he answered in the negative***, saying, however, that he had dreamed of a personage coming to him and *handing him a bunch of keys*, and leaving without explanation. *He did not know that that had any special significance*. A meeting of the Priesthood was arranged for the following morning.

Friday 13 [November 1936]: Priesthood met at 9 A. M. at home of Sister Colvin. Twelve of the local brethren were present, also Elders Kelsch, Bateman and Musser. (13 instead of twelve present.)

Elder Kelsch stated the purpose of our visit, asking several questions of the brethren, and eliciting the following information:

The action taken by the Priesthood in Salt Lake had been voted on adversely, mainly on account of supposing it to have been the submission of Bro. Musser and not the action of the Priesthood.

That, ignoring the action and recommendations of the priesthood, they had organized, using the old form of United Trust, placing Bro. Barlow at the head, and were now operating under that agreement.

Several expressed their feeling that the group was prospering more since the above action, and desired to continue under it.

The majority expressed the belief *that Bro. John Y. Barlow held the keys to Priesthood and was the mouth-piece of God on earth*, and with some this was the

only reason for accepting Bro. Barlow's Management of affairs [in Short Creek]. ***Elders Covington and I. W. Barlow expressed emphatic dissent***, stating *they did not believe Bro. [John Y.] B[arlow] held* ***the keys to Priesthood***, but that he did have authority to seal and was the senior member in the Priesthood group, and as such presided at the meetings of the group, etc.

J. W. Musser explained his views on Priesthood matters: That the special mission and labors of the Priesthood group was to keep plural marriage alive; that we were not called upon to colonize only as the Lord might dictate such a move; that it was the feeling of the Priesthood that the affairs of the Saints s[h]ould be conducted by them in their local communities and not by the Priesthood, we holding ourselves in readiness to give counsel and advice from time to time as may be required and proper. He urged the brethren to unite themselves in spirit in serving the Lord, and not to consider those who did not wish to join them in their temporal experiment, out of harmony with the Gospel; that the time had not come for the establishing of the United Order. The brethren should seek [to] . . . live the spirit of the U[nited] O[rder] in their families, extending that spirit out among the Saints, thus preparing themselves to accept the great principle when the one "Mighty and Strong" [D&C 85:7–8] comes to allot to them their inheritances. Meantime they should display charity and love toward all men who are striving to serve the Lord. Stated *the Lord had not revealed to him* ***who held the Keys to Priesthood***, but that *Bro. Barlow, by reason of his* ***seniority in ordination*** *presided over the Group; that questions pertaining to the Mission of the Group, when acted upon by unanimous vote, were properly settled and such action became* ***the Word of the Lord*** upon the points thus involved. *That when the Lord wanted any man to know who holds* ***the keys to Priesthood****, and that man was prepared to receive the fact, He would reveal [it] in a clear way.* (Diary of Joseph Musser, November 2, 12, 13, 1936, pp. 26–30, Utah State Historical Society)

Even if Musser lacked the knowledge as to who did hold the Keys, one thing that he was certain of, was that Heber J. Grant did not. This he knew, if from no other source, from the 1882 revelation which called Grant to the Apostleship and set forth the conditions of his calling. Therein it is emphatically stated that it is contrary to the law of the Priesthood for God to honor a man who will not honor Him and His Laws. Yet in spite of this revelation, Grant chose to use his Priesthood to command the Saints to obey wicked men rather than God. Judge ye — would the Lord honor and sustain such a man! If God should give a man a commandment to do a work and the Keys of Presidency to over see it, and that same individual refused to do that work and refused to enter therein, while at the same time he went far out of his way to persecute and hinder others who had a desire to enter — is it reasonable to suppose that the Lord would honor such a man as "the one anointed and appointed"?

Not only did Musser know that Grant did not hold the keys, but he also knew that he and his brethren had been given a special commission and dispensation to

see that the Prophetic declaration of President John Taylor came to be fulfilled in the person of President Heber J. Grant during his tenure as President of the Church. Remember his prediction:

if we do not embrace that principle soon ***the Keys will be turned against us***

And again, the warning of President Heber C. Kimball:

Let the ***Presidency of this Church****, and the* ***Twelve Apostles****, and all the authorities unite and say with one voice that they will oppose that doctrine [i.e. Celestial/Plural Marriage],* ***and the whole of them would be damned****.*

In his paper Hales argues that the fact the Manifesto was a lie does not produce Priesthood for the Fundamentalists.[42] To this I would have to agree. But if this is true for Fundamentalism, so also is the reverse of his argument true in the case of the Church. Indeed, if the Manifesto's being a lie does not prove that the Fundamentalists have Priesthood, without a doubt, it certainly does prove that the Church today does not — for the lie of the Manifesto was not intended for the people of God, but rather for the world — yet the Church today has forced it upon all the Saints as a Divine mandate from Heaven — hence apostasy from the restored Gospel and the ultimate loss of the Priesthood![43]

---

perpetuate plural marriage, and this too, regardless of the negative course taken by the Church. This commission was to be valid until the time for the setting in order of the House of God, when the "One Mighty and Strong" would come and the "Times of the Gentiles" would be Fulfilled. (3rd Nephi 16:10–15; D&C 45:17–31, 56–58; 86:7–11; 113:5–10; Luke 21:24; Rom 11:1–32) At this time the commission coming from Joseph F. Smith would come to an end and the House of God would be set in order, and this too, by the man, whoever he may be, who did and would hold and preside in the Keys of the Priesthood.

[42]Brian makes the following statement: "Most modern polygamists realize the importance of utilizing the Keys of Elijah to seal their plural marriages. In their attempts to legitimize their polygamous unions, they often criticize the confusion and ambiguity that surrounded the discontinuation of plural marriages with authorization of the LDS church President between the 1890 Manifesto and 1907. However, confusion and ambiguity do [not] produce priesthood authority." (p. 19)

What is incredible is that the whole purpose in the lie of the Manifesto was to protect the Church against an intolerant government that would not allow the Saints to openly acknowledge and live the Gospel. According to the original plan, the Manifesto was not signed with the intent of doing away with the practice of Plural Marriage, but rather, it was signed in order to establish an "official policy" which would be used for public consumption, with the understanding that the practice of Plural Marriage would be secretly perpetuated on the underground, until a future time when the Government would allow the Saints to live the Principle openly. Even from the very beginning, the private statements of all the brethren who were involved in the issuance of the Manifesto, make it clear that it was intended to be nothing more than public

---

[43]As the future would yet demonstrate, Celestial/Plural Marriage is only one principle among many which the Church would ultimately discard in order to join hands with the damned. In 1887, under the direction of George Q. Cannon, the Church sacrificed political solidarity in order to obtain Statehood, which ultimately led to the dissolution of the Kingdom. In 1890, Woodruff issued the Manifesto. In 1894, he abrogated the Law of Adoption (for more on this see "Adoption — Law of the Kingdom — Forgotten Doctrine of Mormonism", published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, vol. 8: <April 1991> No. 4). In 1895 Woodruff requested the Saints to cease talking about the Adam-God doctrine, and in 1898 it was requested that Sunday School teachers stop talking about it in Church. Some time between 1902 and 1905 the Adam-God doctrine was removed from the Lecture at the Veil in the Temple ceremony. In 1912 Patriarchs and others who persisted in discussing the Adam-God doctrine were threatened with excommunication, and by the 1830s, the idea that it was even taught by President Young was denied by general authorities. Finally, during the administration of David O. McKay, the Church refused to take a stand against the insidious "theory" of Organic Evolution — that great doctrine of Atheism which insists that man evolved from apes. The doctrine put forth during David O. McKay's administration, was that the scriptures do not reveal how God creed man or the world.

Again, during the administration of Heber J. Grant, only the first Presidency, the Twelve Apostles and the Church Patriarch were deemed worthy to receive their Second Anointing. Finally in 1978, under pressure of civil rights leaders, President Kimball elected to ordain the Forbidden race of Cain to the Priesthood and for Canaanites to marry Israelites for Time and Eternity in the Temple.

policy, and a public policy too, which would end at the time when the Government became willing to allow the Practice of Plural Marriage. What is most incredible in all this, is that today the Government is tolerant — it no longer cares! Indeed, it is not the Government which stands in the way of legalizing Plural marriage, but instead it is the political influence of the LDS Church. The Church has become so accustomed to its new found popularity with the world, that it no longer wants the stigma of Plural/Celestial Marriage attached to it.[44]

In the New Testament there is a passage which speaks of a time of apostasy in the latter days:

> Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, *and* ***doctrines of devils****; Speaking lies* ***in hypocrisy****; having their conscience seared with a hot iron.*

It is most significant that in this same passage, one of these *"**doctrines of devils**"* is declared to be that men would be *'Forbidden to marry'* (1 Timothy 4 1–3). The Old Testament says that "children are an heritage of the LORD . . . Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them" (Psalms 127:3–5). If this is true, then notwithstanding men like Heber J. Grant — every man of God ought to strive with his whole heart to have all the children that the Lord will give him.

Let us suppose a case. Let us suppose that the Manifesto was actually a revelation from God.[45] Bearing in mind that Section 132

---

[44]For more on this see: "Changed Faces: The Official LDS Position on Polygamy 1890–1990" (1990) by Martha S. Bradley, *Sunstone*, Vol. 14: (Feb. 1990) 29–32.

[45]That the Manifesto was not a revelation is clear from Wilford Woodruff's own statements. On the day that he signed the Manifesto, he stated that "We are like drowning men, catching at any straw that may be floating by that offers any relief!" ("LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890–1904", *Dialogue A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 45) Such statements do not in any way suggest that the Manifesto was a revelation — nor does it suggest that it was issued as the result of one. On one occasion, President Joseph F. Smith

clearly stated what he knew regarding the original source of the Manifesto. D. Michael Quinn gives the following details regarding this matter:

"from 1891 onward there was evidence of specific administrative conflicts between them [i.e. Joseph F. Smith and George Q. Cannon]. At issue was their differing response as counselors to church President Lorenzo Snow's effort to end all polygamous cohabitation and new polygamous marriages. As early as 1891 the two councilors disagreed on the nature of the 1890 Manifesto which officially ended plural marriage. Cannon argued that because it was inspired the Manifesto was "a revelation from God." When an apostle asked the second councilor [i.e. Joseph F. Smith] at the very same meeting if the Manifesto was a revelation, "President Smith answered emphatically No!" A decade later the conflict between the councilors [again] erupted during a Temple meeting discussion of polygamous cohabitation. Cannon supported Snow's intent to end polygamous [co]habitation among all Mormons. Joseph F. Smith shocked the apostle by the fury of his words towards Cannon. At a meeting with the quorum of the Twelve two days later church President Lorenzo Snow required councilor Smith to formally apologize for the outburst. Two months later Cannon died." (*Decision Making and Tension in the Mormon Hierarchy*, by D. Michael Quinn, 1991, Sunstone Symposium, tape 42; for more on this see *Dialogue* 18: <Spring 1985> 50, 90).

On October 9th, 1890, *The Salt Lake Herald*, which was published by Apostle Heber J. Grant, editorialized that the anti-Mormon *Salt Lake Tribune* 'pretends the declaration is a revelation . . . although no one to day has heard anyone except the lying sheet say it was a revelation.'" (*Dialogue* 18: <Spring 1985> 10) In 1911, Apostle Matthias F. Cowley was called in for a hearing with the Quorum of the twelve to answer to the charge that he had been involved in New Plural Marriages. In the process of making his defense he made the following statement: "Brother Penrose told me once in the city of Mexico, that he had written the manifesto, and it was gotten up so that it did not mean anything and President Smith had told me the same." ("The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley" *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, Vol. 4: <January 1987> 27) At the very beginning, when it was first issued, even *The Deseret News* openly acknowledged that it was not a revelation. Consider the following statement from the Wednesday, October 1st 1890 editorial of the *Deseret Evening News*:

* * * * * *

Passing this by, with the simple comment that such low reflections indicate the sort of person who cast them, we reproduce some of the closing remarks of the Commissioner as reported in the *Globe Democrat*:

"It has been shrewdly suggested 'to President Woodruff,' concluded Commissioner Robertson, 'that it would be exceedingly profitable for him to have

another revelation, declaring that the doctrine of polygamy should be no longer adhered to by the Saints. Such a revelation would greatly assist his case and put him in the light of one willing to abide by the law that seeks the extinction of the horrid crime of which he is the chief apologist. But no revelation has as yet been forthcoming . . . . ."

The suggestion which the Commissioner thinks is "shrewd" is neither original nor sensible. It has been offered many times for several years. It is an evidence of the thoughtless and flippant manner in which anti-"Mormons" attempt to regulate the creed of the Latter-day Saints. A quotation here from the New Testament ought not to be considered out of place, especially by persons who profess respect for Christianity. It is this:

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Revelation, whether it relates to the past, present or future, is not at the command of men. If Col. Robertson knows of any means whereby the Almighty can be compelled to reveal something that will suit him and other persons who make this demand, we would like him to use them without delay. Disbelievers have the right to reject anything purporting to be revelation that does not appeal to their reason or their faith. But they have not the right to expect a revelation to order nor to find fault *because such an absurdity* ***is not forthcoming***. . . . .

When President Woodruff receives anything from a Divine source for the Church over which he presides, he will be sure to deliver the message. And there is no power on earth that can compel him to make ***a counterfeit***, or pretend to anything which to him is not as genuine as the pure light of heaven." (*Deseret Evening News*, 10/1/1890)

Three days later, another similar statement was published by the Deseret News:

October 4th, 1890, Charles Ellis:

CONCERNING REVELATION

A Few Pertinent Thoughts From an Able Pen.

I have read what has been said pro and con of late touching this topic and ask permission to say something about it as a disinterested party.

The controversy has grown out of President Woodruff's recent "Manifesto," and the assumption of his critics is that he should have issued instead a "revelation." That is, the anti-Mormon writers and talkers insist that the declaration should have come from God instead of from Mr. Woodruff. Let us see where this leads.

If God can be dictated to *and compelled to furnish revelations to suit the requirements of any persons who desire to back* ***their schemes*** with divine authority, he ceases to be God and becomes the tool, so to speak of designing men. If, now,

in the Doctrine and Covenants is also a revelation from God, and that it is *at least* equally binding and in force upon us, let us ask the question: "Which is the Highest Law — the Woodruff Manifesto, or the revelation to the Prophet Joseph Smith on Celestial/Plural Marriage."

At the beginning of this Earth's history our Father Adam was faced with another similar dilemma and the decision to which he arrived is applicable to our question. The Lord God gave two laws to Adam. The *First* and *Highest* was to multiply and replenish the Earth. The second commandment was that he should not eat the forbidden fruit. At the same time, he was given explicit instructions, that if he did eat the fruit he would die. In the end, the dilemma was that he had to break one divine edict in order to keep the other. In other words, he could not keep both commandments at the same time. Ultimately he decided that the law of multiplying and replenishing the Earth was a higher law, and so he chose death, and gave his life in order to bring his children into a mortal probation.

In like manner, those who are so misled as to believe that the Manifesto is a revelation from God, issued to terminate the practice of Plural Marriage, are faced with the same dilemma — they must decide which is the Highest Law — Woodruff's Manifesto or the Celestial Law of Eternal/Plural Marriage, and multiplying and replenishing the Earth with a noble posterity.

---

these men (who insist that President Woodruff should have demanded a revelation *instead of issuing his own manifesto*) are honest in their position, they either have a most degrading conception of God, or they do not believe in God.

* * * * * *

But should President Woodruff's critics insist that they do believe in God, in the only true God, as their claim has been so long, then they must concede that "revelation" can only come, not when man wills, but when and how God wills. Such being the case, they must admit, if they are honest in their claims, *that* ***in the absence of revelation****, President Woodruff's manifesto is all that they have any right to ask.* (*Deseret Evening News,* October 4th, 1890)

JOSEPH F. SMITH
—THE REAL SOURCE OF FUNDAMENTALIST AUTHORITY—

Within three years after signing the Manifesto, President Woodruff began to realize that the course which he had taken would ultimately lead to the day when those who persisted in the practice of Plural Marriage would be excommunicated from the Church and would not be allowed in the Temple to receive their Sealings. Knowing this, at the April 6th, 1893 dedication of the Salt Lake Temple, President Woodruff offered up a prayer to God on behalf of these individuals, wherein he prayed that God would grant unto them the blessings of Celestial Marriage, and this too in spite of the fact that they would not be allowed in the Temple:

> Heavenly Father, ***when*** *Thy people* ***shall not have the opportunity*** *of entering this holy house* to offer their supplications unto Thee, and they . . . shall turn their faces towards this Thy holy house and ask Thee for . . . Thy power to be extended in their behalf, we beseech Thee, to look down from Thy holy habitation in mercy and tender compassion upon them, and listen to their cries. Or *when the children of Thy people,* ***in years to come****, shall be separated, through any cause, from this place*, and their hearts shall turn in remembrance of Thy promises to this holy Temple, and they shall cry unto Thee . . . we humbly entreat Thee to turn Thine ear in mercy to them; *hearken to their cries, and* ***grant unto them the blessings for which they ask***. (*Unpublished Revelations* Vol. 3, under date of April 6th, 1893, verses 74–78)

It was in keeping with the prayerful desire and directive of President Woodruff, to perpetuate plural Marriage after the Manifesto, that President Lorenzo Snow told Matthias F. Cowley "that he would not interfere with the unfinished business of President Woodruff."[46] In like manner, in fulfillment to Woodruff's prayer, years later, President Joseph F. Smith called together certain trustworthy individuals and gave them a special dispensation, with authority to

[46]"The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 4: (January 1987) 27.

perpetuate Plural Marriage outside the jurisdiction of the Church.[47] Among these men was John W. Woolley. By and large, the Fundamentalist movement is the outgrowth of this Commission — a special dispensation given by President Joseph F. Smith to John W. Woolley, with the intent that he would perpetuate plural marriage outside the channel of Church authority.

Since the 1930s, historical questions over the Lorin Woolley Story, the Council of Friends and the ordination of 5 men by President Taylor have totally dominated the issue of Fundamentalist Priesthood, thus obscuring the original source of their authority and secret commission from President Joseph F. Smith. There is not time on this occasion to make an investigation into this matter, yet the records, both from the Church and Fundamentalists will bear it out.

When he saw the handwriting on the wall, in an effort to preserve and perpetuate the practice of Plural Marriage here on earth, President Joseph F. Smith authorized certain individuals and Patriarchs to perform plural marriages. This was done under the most solemn covenant of secrecy, that they would not reveal President Smith's involvement. Among these men was John W. Woolley.

According to early Fundamentalist writings, before his death John W. Woolley ordained his son Lorin Woolley as his successor to his appointment and calling.[48] In fulfillment to the same charge, in prophetic foresight, Lorin Woolley perpetuated his commission through the establishment of a council composed of *seven of his friends*. Through these appointments tens of thousands of children have been brought into the world in the plural relationship of the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage.

---

[47]In doing this he placed them under strict injunction that they were not to organize or establish any kind of organization that would compete with the Church. Their sole calling and authority was to perform plural marriages.

[48]*"Keys of the Kingdom" — Where? An Event of the Underground Days* (March 1945) by Francis M. Darter, p. 7.

PLURAL MARRIAGE AND COMMON LAW MARRIAGE

In closing, let us suppose a case. Let us suppose that President John Taylor never ordained five men to perpetuate Plural Marriage, and that neither did President Joseph F. Smith. And let us suppose that the Fundamentalist people are not in possession of the Priesthood. Under what obligation are they to obey the mandates of an apostate Church and hireling Priesthood, who for the sake of friendship with the world,[49] have turned away from the revelations which God has

---

[49]On April 4th, 1920, President Heber J. Grant made the following statement:

"I had intended to read here this morning some of the very splendid things that were said in the United States Senate regarding the Latter-day Saints by the senators from Nevada, from Colorado and from Arizona. . . . I rejoice when men not of our faith can bear the testimony that these men did, respecting the loyalty of our people.

[President Grant here read selections from the speeches of the senators referred to] . . . . .

Since we last met here, it has fallen to my lot to . . . . visit the capital of our Union and to hold a meeting there. It has fallen to my lot to . . . hold a meeting in the capital of Arizona. I wish to say that I rejoice in the wonderful change of sentiment regarding the Latter-day Saints that has come to people wherever I have met with them during the past six months. . . . .

I am thankful that wherever I have traveled during the past six months I have found a feeling of respect, a feeling of love in the hearts of many for the Latter-day Saints, in the hearts of those not of our faith. I heard many very splendid compliments while in Washington by members of the president's cabinet, by senators and representatives, and by officials of the government in the ***Federal Reserve banking departments***, and in others, wherever I went, and with all the people that I met, ***bankers*** *in New York*, Chicago, San Francisco and other cities, I heard good things said of the Latter-day Saints; we are coming into our own, so to speak. Our character is becoming known, and no longer can men lie about the Latter-day Saints, or women either, and get away with the lies with the great majority of the people in our country. (*Conference Reports* April 1920, pp. 4, 11–12)

The following remarks of President Grant were made at the General Conference of the Church, on April 3rd, 1921:

I think that we as a people have very great cause to rejoice in the era of good will and fellowship that is existing today for us as a people, among those

not of our faith, in comparison with the conditions that existed some years ago. I do not know of any single thing that has happened in my experience, during the long time that I have been one of the General Authorities of the Church, that has impressed me more profoundly with the change of sentiment towards the latter-day Saints than the reception that was accorded to me December last when I went to Kansas City and delivered a speech upon the accomplishments of "Mormonism." When I reflect upon the fact that in the leading hotel in that wonderful and progressive city — (I don't know that all of the people here, in fact I feel sure that perhaps the majority of those here are not aware of the fact that although that city is only one-half as large as St. Louis, its bank clearings are larger than those of St. Louis, that in some particular items they stand first, in commerce, among all the cities of the United States . . . .) — I was permitted to . . . . relate the hardships, the drivings and the persecutions of the Latter-day Saints and to have that body of representative men receive that address with approval, applaud it in many places, and many of them come to me after the meeting and shake hands and congratulate me upon the address; and to have some of the members of the Board of Directors of that great club — the Knife and Fork Club of Kansas City — (which I have been informed is the second greatest dinner club in the United States, the Gridiron of Washington standing first) to have them say that they hoped for a return date so that they could hear more of our people . . . . .

A short time ago the editor and publisher of the ***Coast Banker*** a paper that has a circulation all over the ***Twelfth Federal Reserve banking district***, asked me to write an article on the accomplishments of our people. . . . (Conference Reports <April 3rd, 1921> 7–8)

It is evident from Grant's remarks that he is thrilled with the friendship and acceptance which the Church had suddenly found with the world and its prominent bankers etc. But what he neglects to recognize is the great price which was paid in order to purchase their friendship. The world did not suddenly convert and come over to the side of the Church, but rather, it was the Church which at the point of bayonet was forced to give up its principles and convert to the ways of the world. Once the Church finally consented to do this, they all became hail fellows, well met. It is so simple it makes you wonder why the Prophet Joseph Smith, Brigham Young and John Taylor didn't think of it long before.

Among the many principles which were sacrificed upon the alter was Plural/Celestial Marriage. Another was the law of Christ, that the Saints should be one in all things (John 17:9–11, 20–23). Among other things this required political solidarity in unison with the Priesthood, but the Saints were forced into political division, and with this their Union was destroyed. In other words, the price of friendship with the world was that the Saints give up the Kingdom, and conform to the mold of a shallow Sunday-go-to-meeting religion. This is suggested in an 1882 letter which Wilford Woodruff wrote to Lot Smith:

Geo. Q. Cannon started this morning for Washington with John T. Caine and others, to introduce them, etc. There have been many questions come up before the Presidency and Twelve, but *we cannot yet make up our minds* ***to swap off the Kingdom of God*** *for a State government*, for we would rather trust in God than in the government. (Wilford Woodruff letter to President Lot Smith, dated 28th of November 1882, Lot Smith Papers, Special Collections, University of Arizona Library, Tucson, Arizona — I am indebted to Knute J. Knuteson for pointing this document out to me)

In the midst of this demand for compromise from the Federal Government of the United States, we must consider the issue of "Freedom of Religion" in this boasted land of Liberty and home of the Brave? The "bought and paid for" Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States decided that in the case of Mormonism, freedom of religion as intended by the founding fathers was the right to think and believe as you please, but not the liberty to live in accordance with your beliefs! What a magnanimous jesture — why even in the darkest dungeon a man is allowed to think his own thoughts!

In view of all this, the reasoning behind the following remarks of President Brigham Young and others becomes apparent:

Brigham Young: — There is nothing that would so soon weaken my hope and discourage me as to see this people in full fellowship with the world, and receive no more persecution from them because they are one with them. *In such an event, we might* ***bid farewell to the Holy Priesthood*** with all its blessings, privileges and aids to exaltations, principalities and powers in the eternity's of the Gods. (*Journal of Discourses* 10:32)

Brigham Young: — When we see the time that we can willingly strike hands and have full fellowship with those who despise the Kingdom of God, *know ye then that the Priesthood of the Son of God* ***is out of your possession***. (Journal of Discourses 10:273)

Brigham Young: — And when the spirit of persecution, the spirit of hatred, of wrath, and malice ceases in the world against this people, *it will be the time that this people have apostatized and joined hands with the wicked,* ***and never until then****;* which I pray may never come. (*Journal of Discourses* 4:327)

George Q. Cannon: — Thousands of times people have said to me, *"Oh, I wish you Latter-day Saints would abolish that hateful institution [i.e. Plural Marriage]. That is the only thing that makes you objectionable."* This is a great mistake. If we could do such a thing, it would not bring the result that the world imagine. If this is the Church of Christ — as we declare it to be — just as true as it is we will be persecuted. We cannot escape it, *it is an inevitable result of the Gospel*. We might seclude ourselves in the deserts of Sahara, as we secluded ourselves in these mountains some thirty-three years ago, and persecution would reach us. The adversary will not let us alone. The direst persecutions we ever had

given to the founding Prophets of this Dispensation? And not only have they turned against the revelations, but they have also turned against the exalting principles of the Gospel, which are necessary to live in order to prepare the Saints to be brought back into the presence of God. You might just as well feel duty bound to honor the dictates of the Pope as to render obedience to the President of an apostate church!

Inasmuch as it requires Priesthood and the Sealing Keys of Elijah in order to enter into any form of Celestial Marriage, whether monogamous or polygamous — if the above scenario were true, what should the people do? Ought they to refrain from marriage altogether, and not have any children? Or should they enter into marriage and do the best they can to love and serve God, and live the Gospel to the best of their ability — raising up a righteous posterity unto the Lord — and not only to marry one wife, but under the inspiration of Heaven, to marry several — waiting patiently for that time when the Lord will set in order His Kingdom and redeem that chosen few[50] who would honor Him and live His laws.

---

to suffer, occurred before the doctrine of polygamy was taught or believed in. *There is nothing short of complete apostasy*, a complete denial of every principle we have received, *a throwing away of the Holy Priesthood, that can save us from persecution*. When this takes place, when all the chief features of the Gospel are obliterated, when *we can float along the stream* ***and do as the world does****, then and not till then will persecution cease* (*Journal of Discourses* 22:373–374)

James: — know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God. (James 4:4)

John: — If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you (John 15:18–20)

[50]*TPJS* 18; *JD* 11:145; 4:108; 15:357; *Millennial Star* (George Q. Cannon) 42:585, also 44:314; *Deseret News* (Orson F. Whitney) August 11, 1889; *The Contributor* (Brigham Young) 10:362; *Deseret News* (Daniel H. Wells) Nov. 6, 1875, also Dec 9, 1882.

After the issuance of the Manifesto, President George Q. Cannon was placed in a similar situation, wherein he was forced to answer this same question. In attempting to resolve his dilemma he finally came to the conclusion that it would be better to enter into Plural Marriage by Common Law and without Priesthood authority,[51] rather than face the consequences of turning away from the Law

[51]Even during the days of the Prophet Joseph Smith, there were men who entered into Plural marriage by Common Law without a Priesthood Sealing, and this too, under explicit instructions from the Prophet. That this was not adultery is clearly established in a discourse which the Prophet gave at Nauvoo, wherein he stated that men who came from a culture which tolerated plural marriage would be allowed to enter the Church without abandoning their wives. Consider the following:

> Again we heard the Prophet say upon the stand in Nauvoo in a grove near the Temple when he was speaking to a large assemblage of saints, with many other things he said, "If I should reveal the things that God has revealed to me there are some on this stand that would cut my throat or take my heart's blood." We wondered if it was possible that that saying could be true. And again while speaking to the people in that place he supposed a case. He said, "Suppose we sent one of our Elders to Turkey or India or to a people where it was lawful to have several wives, where they practiced polygamy and he should say to them, 'Your laws are not good, you should put away your plural wives; what would they do to him? They would kick them out of their realm," Said he, "God does not care what laws they make if they will live up to them. What shall they preach, said he. "They shall preach the Gospel and nothing but the pure gospel and some will believe and be baptized and he shall say nothing about the gathering but confirm them members in the Church and give to them the Holy Ghost and he shall pass along preaching and baptizing and a man shall receive the Holy Ghost, and that shall teach him of a land of Zion and of the gathering, and when the Elder shall come round again, this Brother shall accost him thus saying, "Elder is there not a land of Zion, a place where saints should gather to?" The Elder should not lie to him. He shall say, "Yes, Brother, there is a land of Zion where saints of God are required to gather to." Then said he to the Elder, "I have five wives and I love one equally as well as I do the other, and now what are the laws in that land. Can I bring my five wives there and enjoy them there as well as I can here?" Said the Prophet, "Yes, the laws in Zion are such that you can bring your wives and enjoy them here as well as there," the elder shall say [just so] to that Brother.
>
> The Prophet went on preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom as if he had not said anything strange or awful, but this to me was the first intimation that I ever received that polygamy would ever be practiced or lawful with this people. The

altogether. Consider the following statements which were made by George Q. Cannon, Lorenzo Snow and President Woodruff in a meeting with the Quorum of the Twelve, four years after signing the Manifesto:

Prophet went to his dinner and as it might be expected several of the first women of the church collected at the Prophet's house with his wife, [and] said thus to the Prophet Joseph, "O Mister Smith, you have done it now. It will never do, why it is all but blasphemy. You must take back what you have said today. It is outrageous. It would ruin us as a people." The Prophet knew it would not avail anything to contend with the sisters. Said he, "I will have to take that saying back and leave it as though there had been nothing said," for he was aware it was a very large pill for them or the people to swallow, but as the Lord had revealed the principal of plural marriage to him, and had informed him that the time had fully come that that doctrine should be taught and practiced by his people, the Latter-day Saints, as it was a very important item pertaining to the fullness of the Gospel there he deemed it wisdom to throw out something for the people to reflect upon that they might begin to digest that very important doctrine which belongs to the dispensation of the fullness of times, but prior to this he had besought the Lord to take this injunction from him that he might not have the responsibility of introducing and putting in practice that order of things, because of the great opposition it would meet, because of the traditions of the people, but it came to pass the Lord instead of releasing him from that burden, He sent an Holy Angel with a drawn sword unto him, saying unto him, Joseph unless you go to and immediately teach that principle (namely polygamy or plural marriage) and put the same in practice that he Joseph should be slain, for thus saith the Lord, the time has now come that I will raise up seed unto me as I spoke by my servant Jacob, as is recorded in the Book of Mormon. Therefore I command my people. (*The Journal of Joseph Lee Robinson* 12; *Note:* The above remarks of the Prophet were recorded by Joseph Lee Robinson sometime afterwards)

Probably the best known example of Common Law marriage being practiced among the people of God is to be found in the Old Testament where Jacob married Leah. Having fulfilled the agreed upon time in seven years of labor, on the evening of his wedding day he went into his tent, in joyful anticipation of consummating a marriage with Rachael his chosen bride. But much to his surprise, when he awoke in the morning he found that he had consummated a marriage with Leah. Consequently he was forced into working an additional seven years for Rachael (Gen. 29:15–28). The fact that the Lord honored this situation as marriage and not adultery is self-evident from the Scriptures, as most of the Twelve tribes of Israel came from the union between Jacob and Leah.

[**George Q. Cannon**] now spoke of the unfortunate condition of the people at present in regard to marriage. A man in Pima married the widow of a deceased brother. He did not realize till after the Manifesto was passed his true condition. Now he is raising up seed to his dead friend, while he himself is likely to be left without posterity. Then there are men whose wives are barren, and are likely to be without representatives in the earth. Young widows are left with the alternative of marrying Gentiles, or remaining single all their lives. It seems that something will have to be done sooner or later to remedy those conditions. My son David died without seed, and his brothers cannot do a work for him, in rearing children to bear his name because of the Manifesto. *I believe in concubinage*, or some plan whereby men and women ***can live together*** *under sacred ordinances and vows* until they can be married. Thus *our* ***surplus girls*** *can be cared for*, and *the law of God to multiply and replenish the earth* be fulfilled. There is the danger of wicked men taking license from such a condition, and of good people taking offense thereat, but such a condition ***would have to be kept secret****, until the laws of our government change* to permit the holy order of wedlock which God has revealed, which will undoubtedly occur at no distant day, in order to correct the social evil. I do not say that this plan is the right one, but *I appeal to the Lord to reveal what will be right in the matter* to avert threatened evils.

Pres. Snow: "I have no doubt but ***concubinage*** *will yet be practiced in this Church*, but I had not thought of it in this connection. When the nations are troubled good women will come here for safety and blessing, and men will accept them as concubines."

Pres. Woodruff: "If men enter into some practice of this character *to raise a righteous posterity,* ***they will be justified*** in it. The day is near when there will be no difficulty in the way of good men securing noble wives. (Abraham H. Cannon Diary, Thursday, April 5th, 1894)

It is significant that in spite of the Manifesto, in the end Presidents Woodruff, Snow, Joseph F. Smith and George Q. Cannon all elected to perform Plural Marriages by the authority of the Priesthood, rather than to enter into Common Law marriages. Consequently most of the General authorities of the church, including President Wilford Woodruff took additional plural wives after the Manifesto, and not only this, but they also performed ceremonies

for others.[52] Nevertheless, the statement as given above clearly

[52]**Wilford Woodruff**: Told Byron H. Allred to move to Mexico with his intended plural wife, where Alexander F. Macdonald would perform the ceremony. Told Anson B. Call to sell his property in the U.S. and move to Mexico with his intended wife. Call was married in polygamy by A. F. Macdonald on December 11, 1890. He gave a note of recognition to Macdonald from President Woodruff. Christian F. Olsen, the first married with post-Manifesto recommendations, was married plurally on October 17, 1890, in Mexico. Personally signed recommends for polygamous marriages performed between October and December 1890. Signed a letter for Franklin S. Bramwell, then a stake high councilman, authorizing plural marriage in Mexico. Authorized Apostle Abraham H. Cannon to take a new plural wife in October 1894. Authorized Anthony W. Ivins to perform polygamous ceremonies in Mexico in June, 1897. Authorized Anthon H. Lund to perform two plural marriages aboard ship, one on the Pacific Ocean and one on the Great Lakes, in the Fall of 1897. Circumstantial evidence indicates that Wilford Woodruff married Madame Mountford as a plural wife in 1897. (*Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 60–65)

Lorenzo Snow: Authorized the performance of plural marriages by the Juarez Stake president for stake members who needed no First Presidency authorization. Before performing a plural marriage in Idaho in October 1898, for Joseph Morrel, Apostle Mattias F. Cowley asked permission of President Snow who "simply told me [i.e. Mattias F. Cowley] that he would not interfere with Brother Woodruff's and Cannon's work." What President Snow had done in October 1898 was stop plural marriages that required his personal knowledge and consent for specific individuals; what Ivins did in Mexico and Cowley did in the United States no longer required the Church President's personal knowledge. (*Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 68–69)

Joseph F. Smith: Gave permission to John W. Taylor to marry Rhoda and Roxie Welling on August 29, 1901. Married Abraham H. Cannon and Lillian Hamlin sometime between June 18 and July 1, 1896. After 1890 his wives bore him eleven children in SLC and two in Idaho. Encouraged Bishop Loren Harmer of Springville to enter into plural marriage in 1897. In February of 1898 he told Joseph W. Summerhays that he could enter into plural marriage under certain conditions. Granted permission to Benjamin Cluff to marry polygamously in August of 1900. Authorized polygamous marriage of Joseph I. Clawson and Celestia Durfee on August 9, 1900. Gave permission for Bishop John T. Whetten to marry polygamously in 1900. Sanctioned A. O. Woodruff's polygamous marriage in January 1901. Gave consent for John W. Taylor's polygamous marriage in August 1901. Authorized Alexander F. Macdonald to perform many ceremonies for polygamous marriages in Mexico throughout 1901. Sent Mormons to Matthias F. Cowley for polygamous ceremonies in 1901. Arranged for Joseph E. Robinson to be married

polygamously by Matthias F. Cowley. Provided Robinson with a yearly allowance of $1800 for the support of his post-Manifesto wives. Reauthorized Anthony W. Ivins to perform polygamous marriages in Mexico for Juarez stake members in 1902. Gave permission for Byron H. Allred and his brother-in-law to be married polygamously in Mexico by Anthony W. Ivins on June 15, 1903. Authorized John A. Woolf to perform polygamous marriages in Canada in 1903. Gave permission for Franklin D. Leavitt to be married polygamously in Canada by John A. Woolf in September, 1903. Admitted to the Senate at the Reed Smoot hearings that he had cohabited with his wives and they had borne him eleven children since the Manifesto. (*Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 83–96)

George Q. Cannon: He was deeply grieved when his son David Cannon died leaving no children. He asked son Abraham H. Cannon to take another wife and raise up seed by her in behalf of his deceased brother. Abraham proposed marrying his cousin Annie in October 1894. Permission for this was obtained from his father, Angus M. Cannon (father of the girl), other members of the First Presidency and Presidents Woodruff and Joseph F. Smith. There is no evidence that this marriage actually took place. Continued to sanction other plural marriages until his death in 1901. Copied the following authorization in the First Presidency letterbook to Apostle George Teasdale for the first plural marriage of a nonresident of the Mexican colonies since the end of 1890: It will be quite satisfactory to all of us for you to render him the services which he needs. Wrote a personal letter of permission for plural marriage for Franklin S. Bramwell in Mexico? In July 1892, George Q. Cannon established the system of written recommends which enabled U.S. residents to go to Mexico for post-Manifesto plural marriage ceremonies. Signed most of these letters of recommendation to George Teasdale, president of the Mormon colonies in Mexico from 1890-1895 and to his successor, Anthony W. Ivins, president of the Juarez stake, organized in 1895. Authorized in 1892 a polygamous ceremony for John A. Bagley, who in May 1893, traveled to the Mexican colonies for such a ceremony and then returned to the U.S. with his bride. Sometime between April 1894 and July 1894, he signed a temple recommend for a polygamous marriage for Hattie Merrill, daughter of Apostle Marriner W. Merrill, president of the Logan Temple. Apostle Merrill performed the ceremony for his daughter and John W. Barnett on July 16, 1894 in the Logan Temple. Commissioned Anthony W. Ivins to perform plural marriages in the Juarez Stake in 1897. Approved polygamous marriage between son Abraham H. Cannon and a wife to raise up seed to his deceased son David. Gave Joseph H. Dean specific approval and letters of authorization to A. W. Ivins, to marry a plural wife on December 3, 1897. Blessed Guy C. Wilson in August 1897, that he would marry polygamously in Mexico and have the children his legal wife had never borne him. Gave Matthias F. Cowley authorization and permission to perform plural marriages. Called his son, Hugh J. Cannon, to marry a plural wife, sometime after 1900. Sent both Hugh and a nephew John M. Cannon to Apostle Matthias F. Cowley for these

plural ceremonies. On August 16, 1900, he asked Lorenzo R. Snow that he not be excommunicated if he married and had more children. According to son Sylvester Q. Cannon, he entered into a relationship with Mrs. Amelia Madsen just before his death, who made a contract with Father for eternity, which upon the death of either of them would be attended to in the Temple. (*Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 61–62, 76–82)

John W. Taylor: First to marry polygamously after the Manifesto. Married Janet Maria Woolley as his 3rd wife on October 10, 1890. Married in a carriage while driving in SLC's Liberty Park at night. Francis M. Lyman performed ceremony. Sealed several couples in polygamous marriages during a trip through Arizona in the late 1890's. Married Rhoda and Roxie Welling (half-sisters) on August 29, 1901. Matthias F. Cowley performed ceremony. According to Janet Maria Woolley, Taylor was given permission to marry the Welling girls by Joseph F. Smith, one day at the temple. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48, No. 1, p. 11) The President at the time was Lorenzo Snow and J. M. Woolley was reportedly mistaken when she said Smith instead of Snow. (*Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 72–73 *see footnote* 257) married Ellen Sandberg in June 23rd, 1909. (Hardy, *Solemn Covenant* 326, 420; *Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 11, 32)

Matthias F. Cowley: Married Harriet Bennion in the Logan Temple in 1899. Ceremony probably performed by Marriner W. Merrill. Also married Lenorah Mary Taylor on September 16th, 1905. Ceremony performed in Canada by local Mormon Patriarch. Married John W. Taylor to Rhoda and Roxie Welling on August 29, 1901. Married Abraham Owen Woodruff and Eliza Avery Clark in 1903. Married Arthur William Hart and Evadyna Henderson in 1903. Married Merriner W. Merrill and Hilda Maria Erickson April 7, 1901. In 1901, probably married Brigham Young Jr. and Hellen Armstrong in 1902. Testified that he could not prove it but he believed that President Woodruff took an additional wife after the Manifesto. Performed plural marriage ceremony for Ben E. Rich April 13, 1898. Performed ceremonies for Hugh J. Cannon and John M. Cannon. Performed ceremonies for Thomas Chamberlain on August 6, 1900 in SLC, and Joseph E. Robinson on April 7, 1901 in SLC. Performed ceremony for John F. Burton at SLC in November 1901. Performed another ceremony for Joseph E. Robinson in 1901. Performed a plural marriage ceremony for John W. Taylor in **1909**. Married Joseph C. Bentley to Mary Maud Taylor in 1901. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 11, 13–15; Hardy, *Solemn Covenant* 170, 182, 207, 267; *Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 72, 80–81, see also footnote 287, 90–91; "Trials for the Membership of John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley", *Doctrine of the Priesthood* 4: <January 1987> 17)

Anthony W. Ivins: Was sent to Mexico as stake leader in 1895. Was given special authority by the First Presidency to seal polygamous spouses to each other

in Mexico away from the reach of U.S. law. These marriages were personally sanctioned by George Q. Cannon. Married William C. Ockey and Ovena Jorgensen in the summer of 1897. Married Joseph H. Dean and Amanda Anderson in Spring 1898 — Married Miles A. Romney and Lily Burrell on October 23, 1898. Married Guy C. Wilson to Melissa Stevens in 1902 — Married Guy C. Wilson to Anna Lowrie Ivins (his daughter) in 1903. Married Heber Farr and Hilda B. Farr in 1904. Married three U.S. residents in Ciudad Juarez on June 22, 1897, through special authorization from G. Q. Cannon. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* 48: <Winter 1980> 18–19, 26; Hardy, *Solemn Covenant* 171–72, 187; Dialogue Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 78) Anthony W. Ivins also married many others both in monogamous and plural marriages — for a list of these, see "Polygamy in Mexico as Practiced by the Mormon Church 1895–1905" by H. Grant Ivins, published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood* Vol. 1: <March 1981> 34–39.

Marriner W. Merrill: Married Hilda Maria Erickson in 1901. Ceremony probably performed by Matthias F. Cowley in Logan Temple. Probably married Matthias F. Cowley and Harriet Bennion in 1899. Performed ceremony for son Charles E. Merrill in a plural marriage in 1903. Performed ceremony for daughter Hattie and John W. Barnett on July 16, 1894 in the Logan Temple. Married Margaret Geddes and David Eccles in Aug. 1898. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 14; *Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 77; Hardy, *Solemn Covenant* 185)

George Teasdale: Married Marion Scoles on October 25, 1897. Married on the Pacific Ocean. Ceremony performed by Anthon H. Lund. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 13)

Anthon H. Lund: Married George Teasdale and Marion Scoles on October 25, 1897. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 13)

Abraham Owen Woodruff: Married first wife, Helen Winters, in 1897. Married Eliza Avery Clark about 1901. Ceremony performed by Matthias F. Cowley in Preston, Idaho. (Hardy, *Solemn Covenant* 208; *Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 13–14) Married plural wife in January of 1901. (*Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 72)

Brigham Young Jr.: Probably married Hellen Armstrong sometime in 1902 (According to ward records she married Brigham Young Jr. on June 7, 1890). Ceremony performed by Matthias F. Cowley. Likely to have performed polygamous marriages himself. Married Clara Mabel Barber Kennedy and James Francis Johnson during the Spring of 1894. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 15) Married a plural wife in August of 1901. (*Dialogue* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 72)

Abraham H. Cannon: Married Lillian Hamlin sometime between June 18, 1896 and July 1. Married at sea. Ceremony performed by Joseph F. Smith? (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 11–12, 16 *see* footnote 22)

establishes the legitimacy of Common Law marriage outside the Priesthood. And this being the case, even if the Fundamentalists had no Priesthood, they would be far better off to follow the course suggested above by President Cannon, than to pursue the path taken by the church, under the presumption that the Manifesto was a Revelation from God.

Woodruff himself makes it clear that the Manifesto was not a revelation — as he explains his motives in his own words:

I have arrived at a point in the History of my life as the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints where I am under the necessity of acting for ***the Temporal Salvation*** of the Church. The United State Government has taken a Stand & passed Laws to destroy the Latter Day Saints upon the Subject of polygamy or [the] Patriarchal order of Marriage. And

---

B. H. Roberts: Was denied seat in Congress in 1900 on grounds of continued unlawful cohabitation with his plural wives. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 20–21) Probably took Dr. Margaret Curtis Shipp as his 3rd wife in the Spring of 1894. (Hardy, *Solemn Covenant* <1992> 247)

Reed Smoot: His seat in Senate was put before trial on the grounds that he and his brethren in the ruling councils of the Church continued to approve the practice of polygamy. His trial lasted almost three years. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 21)

Francis M. Lyman: Married John W. Taylor and Janet Maria Woolley on October 10, 1890. (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 11)

Heber J. Grant: Was denied permission to take plural wife by Joseph F. Smith. Was also reported to have said: "I am a lawbreaker; so is Bishop Whitney; so is B. H. Roberts. My wives have brought me only daughters. I propose to marry till I get wives who will bring me sons." (*Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 15)

For more general information on Church sanctioned plural marriages see: "LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890–1904", by D. Michael Quinn, *Dialogue a Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 18: (Spring 1985) 9–105; "The Taylor — Cowley Affair and the Watershed of Mormon History", by Victor W. Jorgensen and B. Carmon Hardy, *Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Winter 1980> 4–36; also *Solemn Covenant — The Mormon Polygamous Passage*, by B. Carmon Hardy, published in 1992 by the University of Illinois Press.

after Praying to the Lord & feeling inspired by his spirit I have issued the following Proclamation which is sustained by My Councilors and the 12 Apostles [as of this time only 4 of the Twelve had seen the Manifesto]:

Sept. 25 1890
Official Declaration
To whom it may Concern

Press dispatches having been sent for Political purposes from Salt Lake City which have been widely published to the Effect that the Utah Commission in their resent report to the secretary of the interior allege that plural marriages are Still being solemnized and that forty or more such marriages have been contracted in Utah since last June or during the past year, also that in public discourses the Leaders of the Church have taught Encouraged and urged the Continuance of the practice of Polygamy[.] I therefore as president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints do hereby in the most solemn manner declare that these charges are false. We are not teaching polygamy or plural marriage nor permitting any person to Enter into the practice and I deny that Either forty or any other number of Plural marriages have during that Period been solemnized in our temples or in any place in the territory. One Case has been reported in which the parties alleged that the marriage was performed in the Endowment House in Salt Lake City in the Spring of 1889, But I have not been able to learn who performed the ceremony. What Ever was done in the matter was without my knowledge. In consequence of this alleged occurrence the Endowment [House] was taken down by my instruction without Delay.

Inasmuch as laws have been Enacted by congress forbidding plural marriages which laws have been pronounced constitutional by the court of the last resort, I hereby declare my intention to submit to those laws and to use my influence with the members of the Church over which I preside to have them do likewise. There is nothing in my teachings to the Church or those of my Associates during the time specified which Can reasonably be construed to inculcate or Encourage polygamy and when any Elder of the Church has used language which appeared to Convey such teaching he has been promptly reproved. And I now publicly declare that ***my advice*** to the Latter Day Saints is to refrain from Contracting any Marriage *forbidden by the Law of the land*. Wilford Woodruff president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. (*Wilford Woodruff's Journal*, 1833–1898, Typescript, Volume 9: <September 25th, 1890> 112–114)

As President Woodruff explains himself, when he issued the Manifesto, he did it for the "***Temporal Salvation*** of the Church" — the Spiritual Salvation of the Church had nothing to do with it!

Woodruff states that "after Praying to the Lord & feeling inspired by his spirit", he issued the Manifesto. What he is suggesting is that the Spirit of God "inspired" him to lie to the Federal Government of the United States. It is not my intention to debate the morality of such an idea, but the Scriptures teach that God is "a God of Truth, and canst not lie" (Ether 3:12). On top of this, the book of Isaiah Prophetically speaks of the Manifesto as "a Covenant with Death and an Agreement with Hell". In continuing it states that through *False Revelation* the Priest and the Prophet are out of the way — that they err in vision, and stumble in judgment:

> Wherefore hear the word of Yahweh, ye scornful men, that rule this people . . . . Because ye have said, *We have made a covenant with death*, and *with hell are we at agreement*; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: *for we have made* ***lies our refuge***, *and* ***under falsehood*** *have we hid ourselves* (Isaiah 28:**14–15**, 1–22)

In this passage, "Death" and "Hell" are equated with Satan and his kingdom, with whom certain "Priests" or "Prophets" have entered into "Covenant" or "Agreement". The "Agreement" or "Covenant" is a concession, wherein certain authorities in the Priesthood have made a promise to obey Satan and the laws of his kingdom rather than God. Of course this is a lie and their intent is that in the end they will obey God rather than Satan. This trick upon Satan is their "refuge of lies" and the "falsehood" under which they have hid themselves. However, from the Prophecy, it is obvious that they have failed in their intention, for in describing the lie, the Prophecy says that the "bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it: and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." In the end, it says that their "covenant with death shall be disanulled", and their "agreement with hell shall not stand". Finally it says that: "when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it." (Isa. 28:20, 18) In veiw of this passage,

as well as many others, it is difficult to believe that God would be the inspiring source of a lie. On the other hand, it is true that even so good a man as Abraham lied to the Pharaoh in order to save his own life (Gen. 12:14–20). And be it remembered, in the case of the Manifesto, it was not Woodruff's own life that he was endeavoring to save. But then, Abraham did not make the mistake of attempting to give God the credits for his lie. Again, the New Testament states that "***God*** *shall send them strong delusion, that they should* ***believe a lie***" (Thessalonians 2:11). However, this passage does not state that God was the author of the lie, but only that He suffered the lie to be sent unto them, "That they all might be damned" because they received not the love of the "Truth".

In any case, in returning to our subject, to be sure, as a consequence of Woodruff's actions, the Church did survive as a ***temporal institution*** — and that too, thanks to the stock market preoccupation of President Heber J. Grant, in true Babylonian style, as an immense corporate empire. Yet in considering this matter on all sides, we must remember the price which it has cost in terms of the spiritual growth and development of the saints, and the church as an institution. Rather than rising the church and its members *as a body* have sunk and declined to the level of the lowest common denominator, or that level which the least of all saints can still attain while they still embrace the world. By and large the church has become thoroughly Americanized as a shallow Sunday-go-to-meeting religion.

Indeed, lifted up and proudly flying high, on top of the church administration building, and then again on the west side of the Salt Lake Temple, is the American Flag, that it might be recognized by all, that the church and Temple represents an institution which has been subdued and subordinated to the corrupt Government of man. This is in direct contrast to the Holy and Sacred Edifice which the Temple of God was intended to be — the Capital building of the Kingdom of God, made expressly for the purpose of symbolizing the Presence of God and His Government here on Earth. Indeed, rather than flying the American flag, they ought to be flying the flag

of the Kingdom of God. This is just as it is in all foreign embassies which are built on American soil. Every embassy flies the flag of their native country.

At this late date, as far as the institution of the church is concerned, the exalting principles of the Celestial Kingdom are beyond their grasp, both mentally and spiritually. Indeed, if an active member of the church were to attempt to live the Principles of the Gospel with that same zeal which is set forth in the *Lectures on Faith*,[53] at the very least, that person would be labeled by the "brethren" as an unreasonable Fanatic.

So why did President Woodruff issue the Manifesto. If it was really the will of God, and if as Woodruff said, the Lord told him what to write, why was it necessary for Charles W. Penrose to rewrite it — to get it up in shape "so that it did not mean anything".[54] Why didn't the Lord just give a revelation commanding the cessation of Plural Marriage — it would have made things so much simpler!

In view of the historical record, the answers to these questions are self evident. In a word, obviously the Lord did not tell Woodruff what to write — if he had he would not have felt like "drowning men, catching at any straw that may be floating by that offers any relief!"[55]

As for the question about the Lord sending a revelation — the truth is He did. There is in fact, another entry which Woodruff recorded in his diary, and one too that contains a message from God which is altogether different from the Manifesto. The above entry was written into Woodruff's diary the day after he signed the

---

[53]It is good to remember that the Lectures on Faith formed an integral part of the Doctrine and Covenants, until the administration of President Heber J. Grant, who took it upon himself to remove them from the sacred cannon of Scripture.

[54]F. C. Collier, "The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley", published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood* <January 1987> 27.

[55]D. Michael Quinn, LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890–1904, published in *Dialogue A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 18: <Spring 1985> 45; original source: Joseph H. Dean Diary, 24, Sept. 1890.

Manifesto. In it he states that he acted out *of "**necessity**"* and for *"the **temporal salvation** of the Church"* — and all this because as he said, the government of the United States had passed laws with the explicit intent of destroying the Church. In all of this nowhere is revelation mentioned in Woodruff's decision. In contrast to this, only 10 months before, he entered another message into his diary which concerned the ***spiritual salvation*** *of the Church*. However, in this instance there was a world of difference, in that this earlier message was not spawned out of coercion and threats from a Satanic Government — nor did it come as the result of incessant pressure from high powered Church agents. On the contrary, it originated in spite of them and by way of direct revelation from Heaven. And instead of being gotten up "so that it did not mean anything", its intent was direct to the point and easy to be understood:

Thus saith the Lord, to my servant Wilford, I the Lord have heard thy prayers and thy request, and will answer thee by the voice of my spirit. Thus saith the Lord, unto my servants the Presidency of my church . . . . . Let not my servants who are called to the Presidency of my Church, ***deny my word*** *or my law, which concerns* ***the salvation*** of the children of men. Let them pray for the Holy Spirit, which shall be given them to guide them in their acts. ***Place not yourselves in jeopardy*** *to your enemies* ***by promise***. Your enemies seek your destruction and the destruction of my people. If the Saints will hearken unto my voice, and the counsel of my servants, the wicked shall not prevail. Let my servants who officiate as your counselors before the courts, make their pleadings as they are moved upon by the Holy Spirit, ***without any further pledges*** *from the Priesthood* and they shall be justified. . . . . Let my servants call upon the Lord in mighty prayer. Retain the Holy Ghost as your constant companion and act as you are moved upon by that Spirit, and all will be well with you. . . . . Awake, O Israel, and have faith in God and his promises and he will not forsake you. I the Lord will deliver my Saints from the dominion of the wicked, *in mine own due time and way*. I cannot deny my word, neither in blessings nor judgments. Therefore let mine Anointed gird up their loins, watch and be sober, ***and keep my commandments***. Pray always and faint not; exercise faith in the Lord and in the promises of God; be valiant in the testimony of Jesus Christ. The eyes of the Lord and the heavenly hosts

are watching over you and your acts. Therefore be faithful until I come. I come quickly to reward every man according to the deeds done in the body. Even so, Amen. (*Unpublished Revelations* 89:1–2, 4–9, 18, 21–27; for the original source see Journal of Wilford Woodruff, November 24th, 1889, Church Historian's Office)

According to Charles W. Penrose the Manifesto was gotten up "so that it did not mean anything". One of the reasons for this was to place Woodruff in compliance with his own revelation — that there would not be "any further pledges from the Priesthood". Consequently the Manifesto was issued by way of "advice" rather than as a command from the Lord. Woodruff "advises the Saints" to refrain from entering into any marriage which is forbidden by the "Law of the Land". The "Law of the Land" is defined in an 1833 revelation to the Prophet Joseph Smith as the "Constitutional" Law of the Land, which supports the principles of freedom in "maintaining rights and privileges" (D&C 98:4–13). On top of this, an 1882 revelation given to President Taylor declares the anti-Polygamy laws to be ***unconstitutional***, and commands the Saints not to obey them, but rather to obey God (*Unpublished Revelations* 80:34–40). Consequently, according to revelation, the anti-polygamy laws cannot possibly be equated with "the Law of the Land". Yet even if they were, still laws enacted by congress do not have jurisdiction on the high seas, or on foreign soil in Mexico or Canada. This is the reason so many of the brethren were married plurally out of the country. Yet still many others were married in the states. In view of all this, it is apparent that just as Penrose said, the Manifesto was gotten up "so that it did not mean anything".

History makes it clear that the Manifesto was a deception. As Charles Penrose explained it on another occasion in England, it was gotten up in an attempt "to beat the Devil at his own game".[56] Un-

[56]In a sworn statement, Thomas J. Rosser told of a meeting held in Bristol, England, in May of 1908, wherein Charles W. Penrose met with the missionaries, and answered their doctrinal questions. This statement reads as follows:

"..... On Monday morning, the 25th, our Conference Priesthood Meeting was held, which lasted four hours and a half. After the preliminary exercises, President

fortunately, from the sad story which followed, it becomes clear to all those who love the *Truth* and the *Fulness of the Gospel, that in this effort the Manifesto has miserably failed. The reason for this is obvious — in a word, because it is not possible to beat the Devil at his own game. This is true for the most obvious of all reasons — indeed, it is Satan's game and he cheats — Satan makes and changes the rules to suit himself — and one of the rules is that he can lie and deceive, but we cannot! The Revelations of God make it clear that there is only one way to beat the Devil, and that is by strict compliance to the Laws of God — as the doctrine is set forth in Scripture, it is expected that we shall live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" — and this too, even if it costs us our lives! (Matt 4:4; D & C 98:4–14) For this reason it behooves the Saints that they should "obey God rather than man" (Acts 5:29), and that they should not entangle themselves by 'playing games with the Devil'.*

Charles W. Penrose asked if any of the brethren had any questions on their minds, and if so, to present them now before he delivered his message to us.

"Up went my hand. 'All right,' he said. 'President Penrose,' I said, 'I have heard much discussion on the principle of Plural Marriage, some saying that it is withdrawn from the earth and that the Manifesto was a revelation from God. Dear President, what about this case?' Then I related to him the testimony of the Sister, which is written above [i.e she was an investigator who believed in "every principle of the gospel but Plural Marriage". Ultimately she received a revelation wherein she "heard the voice of the Lord saying that Plural Marriage is true and was instituted from before the foundation of the world."], and then I asked him, 'Why should she receive this testimony if God has withdrawn that principle from the earth, and the Manifesto is a true revelation from God?'

"President Penrose then rose to his feet, scratched the side of his head with his right hand for a moment or so, then stretched out his right hand toward us and said, 'Brethren, I will answer that question, if you will keep it under your hats. I, Charles W. Penrose, wrote the Manifesto . . . [i.e. he edited it]. It's no revelation from God, for I wrote it. Wilford Woodruff signed it to beat the Devil at his own game." (Richard S. Van Wagoner *Mormon Polygamy A History* <Salt Lake City 1989> 187; see also: B. Carmon Hardy *Solemn Covenant — The Mormon Polygamous Passage* <1992 Urbana and Chicago> 164–165, note 141; original source: Robert C. Newson Is the Manifesto A Revelation? <n.p. 1956> 6–8.

Collier's Publishing Co. Order Form

New from Collier's Publishing:

Order Form *Quantity*

Unpublished Revelations Vol. 1, 3rd Enlarged Ed . . . . . $45.00 _____

The Book of Revelations . . . . . $30.00 _____

New Issues *of* Doctrine of the Priesthood

Vol. 14 No. 1; An Open Letter To Dr. D. Michael Quinn, Ex-Professor Of History At BYU, Being A Review Of His Recent Book: *The Mormon Hierarchy Origins Of Power* . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 28 No. 4: The Early Israelite/Christian Doctrine Regarding The Incarnation of Yahweh And Satan At The Beginning of the World . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 29 No. 4: The Practice of Plural Marriage In the Bible and The Obscuring of the Biblical Text in Passages Relating to Polygamy . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 4: The Latter-Day Practice of Plural Marriage Foretold In the Book of Mormon — The Prophet's March 1831 Revelations Regarding Plural Marriage & Eternal Marriage — The Prophet's 17 July 1831 Revelation Regarding Plural Marriage With the Lamanites — The Lord's 1833 Rebuke to Joseph and Emma For Not Having Entered into Plural Marriage, and The Prophet's Subsequent Marriage to Fanny Alger . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 7: Celestial Family Union and a Perfect Law of Theocracy, As Taught and Practiced by the Prophet Joseph Smith in his Extended Family Kingdom at Nauvoo, or "The Principle" . . . . . $13.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 8: A New Amalgamated Text of Joseph's Last Doctrinal Discourse — the Plurality of Gods 16 June 1844 . . . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 9: The Sin of Sodom, or a Biblical Examination Of Homosexuality . . . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 2: The Adam-God Doctrine as Taught in the Bible — Being A Response to Walter Martin . . . . . $14.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 8: The One Anointed and Appointed and Its Relationship to The Church of the Firstborn and The Kingdom of God, or Council of Fifty . . . . . $12.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 11: The Whites — The Blacks and The Right of Priesthood — and Racism as Taught and Established by God in the Bible – Part 1 . . . . . $14 .00 _____

Order Form *Quantity*

Vol. 31 No. 12: The Curse Of Canaan, And Who Are The Canaanites, And What Ham Did UNTO Noah . . . . . $7 .00 _____

Vol. 32 No. 1: Regarding the Indian Prophet . . . . . $6.00 _____

Other Hardback Books

Unpublished Revelations Vol. 2 . . . . . $35.00 _____

The Teachings of President Brigham Young Vol. 3 1852–1854 . . . . . $35.00 _____

Manuscript History of Brigham Young 1847–1850 . . . . . $40.00 _____

President Brigham Young's Teachings on The Adam-God Doctrine, Vol 1, an Organized Collection of His Own Statements, by Fred C. Collier; Formerly Published under the Title: *President Brigham Young's Doctrine on Deity, Vol 1* . . . . . $45.00 _____

Kirtland Council Minute Book . . . . . $30.00 _____

Nauvoo High Council Minute Books of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Edited by Fred C. Collier . . . . . $30.00 _____

The Office Journal of President Brigham Young — 1858–1863 Book D, edited by Fred C. Collier . . . . . $40.00 _____

Mary Cox Lee — A Remarkable Lady and an Inspired Principle . . . $16.00 _____

Issues *of* ***Doctrine of the Priesthood***

Vol. 1 No. 2: *Re-Examining the Lorin Woolley Story* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 1 No. 3: *Polygamy in Mexico* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 1 No. 4: *The Church of the Firstborn & the Holy Order of God* . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 1 No. 5: *Priesthood & the Law of Succession, Part 1 and 2* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 2 No. 1: *Unpublished Adam–God Discourses of Brigham Young 1852–1877* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 2 No. 2: *The Adam–God Doctrine in a Nutshell — The Doctrine as Taught by President Brigham Young in His Own Words;* formerly published under the title: *Brigham Young Speaks* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 3 No. 1: *The Nauvoo Doctrine Part 1, The Concept* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 3 No. 2: *The Nauvoo Doctrine in Light of Alma Chapter 13* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 4 No. 1: *The Trials of Apostles John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 4 No. 2 *The Political Platform of the Manifesto* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 4 No. 3; Vol. 5 No. 1; Vol. 5 No. 2 — *President Brigham Young's Doctrine on Deity — an Organized Collection of His Own Statements Part 1, Part 2, Part 3* . . . . . $20.00 _____

Order Form *Quantity*

Vol. 5 No. 3: *So, You Want Celestial Glory* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 4: *The Trinity and the Holy Spirits — The Doctrine as Joseph Taught It,* 3rd. Enlarged Ed. . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 5: *The Suspension of Plural Marriage and the Fulfillment Of Prophecy* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 6: *In Defence of Celestial Marriage* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 8: *Polygamy: Its Genetic and Sociological Consequences* . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 10 *Joseph Smith's Grammar & Alphabet of the Egyptian Language* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 5 No. 11: *Angel of the Prairies* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 6 No. 1: *Nauvoo Diaries & Writings of William Clayton Part 1 The Temple History Journal* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 5: *Patriarch Benjamin F. Johnson's Letter to Elder George F. Gibbs, 1903* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 8: *Analyzing the Different Orders of the Patriarchal Priesthood* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 9: *Independent Fundamentalists and Their Claims to the Fulness of the Priesthood* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 10: *The Apostleship: Apostolic Succession and the Authority Of the Quorum of the Twelve* . . . . . $6.00 _____

Vol. 7 No. 12: *The Trial of Sidney Rigdon First Counselor to the Prophet Joseph Smith* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 1: *New Light on the Ancient Hebrew/ Christian Doctrine On Deity Part 1* . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 2: *The Common Origin of Ancient Hebrew/Pagan Religion And the Demise of Goddess the Hebrew* . . . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 3: *The Matriarchal Priestess-hood & Emma's Right to Succession as High Priestess & Queen* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 4: *Adoption — Law of the Kingdom, Forgotten Doctrine Of Mormonism* . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 8 No. 10: *Answers to Contradictions and Scriptural Problems Relating to the Adam-God Doctrine* . . . . . $5.00 _____

Vol. 9 No. 4: *The Church of the Firstborn and its Formal Organization On April 3rd, 1992; Together with a Brief Summary of Its Principles and Doctrinal Teachings and a Short History of Succession in the Priesthood* . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 10 No. 1: *The One Anointed and Appointed — That One Man Office In the Priesthood – An Open Letter to All Those Who Would be Saints* . $6.00 _____

Order Form *Quantity*

Vol. 12 No. 4: *The Father and the Son the Two Gods of the Old Testament* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 13 No. 1: *New Light on the Lorin Woolley Story and Early Fundamentalist Beginnings* . . . . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 14 No. 1; An Open Letter To Dr. D. Michael Quinn, Ex-Professor Of History At BYU, Being A Review Of His Recent Book: *The Mormon Hierarchy Origins Of Power* . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 18 No. 1: *The Church of the Firstborn — It Articles of Faith and a Short History from the Time of Adam to the Present* . . . . .$6.00 _____

Vol. 28 No. 4: *The Early Israelite/Christian Doctrine Regarding The Incarnation of Yahweh and Satan At The Beginning of The World* . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 29 No. 4: *The Practice of Plural Marriage in the Bible and The Obscuring Of the Biblical Text in Passages Relating to Polygamy* . . $10.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 4: *Plural Marriage in the Book of Mormon and Early Church History — The Lord's 1833 Rebuke to Joseph and Emma For Not Having Entered into Plural Marriage and The Prophet's Subsequent Marriage to Fanny Alger* . . . . . $8.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 7: *Celestial Family Union and a Perfect Law of Theocracy, As Taught and Practiced by the Prophet Joseph Smith in his Extended Family Kingdom at Nauvoo, or "The Principle"* . . . . . *$13.00* _____

Vol. 30 No. 8: *A New Amalgamated Text of Joseph's Last Doctrinal* Discourse — the Plurality of Gods 16 June 1844 . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 30 No. 9: The Sin of Sodom, or a Biblical Examination Of Homosexuality . . . . . $7.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 2: The Adam-God Doctrine as Taught in the Bible — Being A Response to Walter Martin . . . . . $14.00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 8: The One Anointed and Appointed and Its Relationship to The Church of the Firstborn and The Kingdom of God, or Council of Fifty . . . . . $10 .00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 11: The Whites — The Blacks and The Right of Priesthood — and Racism as Taught and Established by God in the Bible – Part 1 – . . . . . $14 .00 _____

Vol. 31 No. 12: The Curse Of Canaan, And Who Are The Canaanites, And What Ham Did To Noah . . . . . $7 .00 _____

Vol. 32 No. 1: Regarding the Indian Prophet . . . . . $6.00 _____

Bundled Set
of
Hardback Books

100% Retail . . . . . **Total: $346.00** _____

30% Off

30% Discount . . . . . **Total: $242.20** _____

---

3 or More Copies
of
Any Hardback Book or Books

20% Discount

Bundled Set
of
All Issues
of
Doctrine of the Priesthood

100% Retail for 46 Issues . . . . . **Total: $344.00**

40% Discount . . . . . **Total: $206.40** _____

Sub-Total: $ _____

Shipping add 10%, $4.00 Min. $25.00 Max.: $ _____

COD add $3.50: $ _____

Total: $ _____